

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

JANUARY 1941

THE INFLUENCE OF DOCTRINE UPON THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

THE traveller who goes 'in search of Ireland' with Mr. H. V. Morton as his guide will not be long in Dublin before he visits the library of Trinity College to feast his eyes upon the Book of Kells. When at last he turns aside to glance at other objects in the same or the adjoining case, his eyes may chance to fall upon a Greek cursive manuscript. After reading a couple of lines he will recognize that the open page contains the last chapter of the First Epistle of St. John, and to his delight he will find the notorious Comma Johanneum, the statement about the Three Heavenly Witnesses. For this is no other than the 'Codex Britannicus', the Montfort Codex, that sixteenth-century minuscule into which the spurious proof-text of the doctrine of the Trinity had been intruded from a corrupt text of Jerome's Vulgate. Everyone knows the story of the rash promise made by Erasmus to Stunica, that if even a single Greek MS. could be produced which contained these words he would print the passage in the third edition of his *Greek Testament*. This recent and worthless manuscript was brought forward, and Erasmus, like Herod, with sorrow did what was required of him 'for his oath's sake'. It is worthy of record that the great *Complutensian Polyglot* (whose editor-in-chief was Stunica),¹ printed before the first edition of Erasmus though published later, also contains these unauthentic words. The result of Erasmus's hasty pledge was that the verse came into the *Textus Receptus*, and was

¹ See C. H. Turner's fascinating lecture, *The Early Printed Editions of the Greek Testament* (Oxford, 1924).

accordingly incorporated into the English Version. Its contemptuous omission from the R.V., without even the dignity of a marginal note calling attention to its absence from every ancient Greek MS., provoked a storm of indignation which is remembered by the senior generation in our midst, and can be read about by the curious who dip into the files of journals ranging through the early eighties of the last century. What was this sacrilegious mutilation of the sacred text but the inevitable outcome of the monstrous policy of allowing Jews, Turks, Infidels and Heretics a place on the Revision Committee? At any rate, the presence of eminent Presbyterian and Nonconformist scholars in the Jerusalem Chamber, and the acceptance of Dean Stanley's invitation by a learned Unitarian divine, Dr. Vance Smith, when the Revisers dedicated themselves to their solemn task at a celebration of Holy Communion in Westminster Abbey, had already given rise to frantic protests and to the confident prophecy that the taint of heresy would be found to infect the revised translation. Now that the Three Heavenly Witnesses were summarily dismissed from the sacred Canon, what further vindication could be required of the misgivings that had been so forcibly expressed by the faithful! To-day we can afford to laugh at this particular exhibition of ignorance joined with bigotry. But a far deeper issue was raised by this controversy. It soon became apparent that something more than the theological soundness of the Revisers, or even their intellectual integrity, was at stake. For almost simultaneously there came from the press Westcott and Hort's *Greek Testament*, the first edition to be carried through on lines of scientific criticism since the mass of evidence available in modern times had come to light. It was known that this text had carried great weight in the deliberations of the Revision Committee. Now Westcott and Hort had discarded the Textus Receptus as a late form of the text which only represented a stage reached in the time of John Chrysostom, and they relied very largely upon our two oldest Uncial Greek MSS., Aleph and B. They took into

account the evidence of other groups of authorities, both Greek MSS. and early versions, and the testimony of the early Fathers. The result of all their researches was a text which they believed to go back as far as our knowledge will take us in the direction of the original autographs of the books of the New Testament.

This text was assailed with great learning and almost incredible ferocity by Dean Burgon. The three lines of his attack were (a) that an overwhelming preponderance of witnesses is on the side of the Traditional Text; (b) that the Traditional Text preserved the words of Holy Scripture in the form in which this sacred treasure had been an integral part of the life of the Church for a thousand years and half a thousand more; (c) that those other forms of the textual tradition which diverge from the Traditional Text are marked not only by signs of gross slovenliness but by deliberate falsifications of the true text.

We need spend no time over the first two arguments. No one to-day would treat seriously the contention that quantity is to be weighed against quality in the evaluation of evidence. The second reason is simply an appeal to sentimentality, or else a resort to a doctrine of the infallibility of the Church, which in matters of scholarship finds little support from historical study. But when we come to the third line of attack we find a way of approach opened up which is pregnant with possibilities.

In the particular form in which Burgon and Miller stated their case judgment went against them, as on almost every other count, a generation ago. They urged that the great codices Aleph and B were 'tainted with sceptical tendencies, and especially with minimizing the Divinity of our Lord'. There is no ground at all for this railing accusation. But they were probably right in denying the assertion so confidently made by Hort:¹ 'It will not be out of place to add here a distinct expression of our belief that even among the numerous

¹ *Introduction*, p. 282.

unquestionably spurious readings of the N.T. there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes.'

Before considering some of the evidence which seems to contradict this optimistic opinion, we may perhaps suggest that the source-criticism of the Gospels, which was hardly under consideration in this country fifty years ago, points to the presence of this factor when the earliest Gospel was being handled by the later Evangelists. We have only to look at the careful analysis made by Sir John Hawkins¹ of the changes made by Matthew and Luke in taking over material from Mark, to remember that concern for the Divine dignity of our Lord, or fear that harsh expressions might be misunderstood to the detriment of His name, led to a careful editorial handling of some passages. If Matthew could correct 'Why callest thou me good? none is good save one, even God', into 'Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good'; or if the words attributed to Jesus by Mark 'Not even the Son' in the saying, 'Of that day or hour no man knoweth', can be omitted by later Evangelists, why should we expect a more detached attitude at a time when early scribes were handling books that had not yet reached the stage of canonical sacrosanctity? It is just possible that such opportunities of early modification are covered by words in which Hort continues the passage just quoted. 'The licence of paraphrase occasionally assumes the appearance of wilful corruption, where scribes allowed themselves to change language which they thought capable of dangerous misconstruction; or attempted to correct apparent errors which they doubtless assumed to be due to previous transcription; or embodied in explicit words a meaning which they supposed to be implied . . . They bear witness to rashness, not to bad faith.' 'It is true', Hort continues, 'that dogmatic preferences to a great extent determined theologians, and probably scribes, in their choice between rival readings already in existence: scientific criticism was virtually unknown, and in its absence the

¹ *Horae Synopticae*, 2nd ed., pp. 117-20.

temptation was strong to believe and assert that a reading used by theological opponents had also been invented by them. Accusations of wilful tampering with the text are accordingly not infrequent in Christian antiquity; but, with a single exception, wherever they can be verified, they prove to be groundless, being in fact hasty and unjust inferences from mere diversities of inherited text.' That one exception for which Westcott and Hort make allowance is, of course, Marcion's notorious edition of *Gospel* and *Apostle*. That eccentric genius issued a text of Luke and of the ten Pauline Epistles in which the editorial blue pencil had been used with considerable freedom and with unmistakably dogmatic intention. But Hort denies that outside Marcion's own sect this mutilated text had any influence, and that other readings which he has been accused of introducing were probably already in texts of copies which came into his hands. It might have been thought that a second exception would be allowed in the case of Tatian. But as this harmonizer is known to have habitually abridged the passages which he combined, he is given the benefit of the doubt, and his excisions are attributed to conciseness rather than to doctrinal prejudice.

When scholars who devoted such rare gifts to the prolonged examination of the history of the New Testament text came to so definite a conclusion it seems presumptuous to question their verdict. It may well be that the exceptions to the general rule are few, and that it is only in the most rare and doubtful cases that we may suspect that such a dogmatic alteration of the original text has gained an almost universal acceptance in the later history of the tradition. But it is at least a healthy sign when students come to look upon Textual Criticism as something related to the organic life of the Christian community. This aspect of the study has been emphasized by two English scholars who have done much to contribute to the progress of the science since the time of Westcott and Hort. Thus Professor C. H. Turner began that valuable series of articles in the *Journal of Theological Studies* more than thirty

years ago with these striking words: 'A Church Historian may perhaps venture to think that something of the difficulties which repel so many students from the subject of textual criticism is due to the habit of treating it too much as a matter of the criticism and classification of documents, and too little as a branch of living history. After all the N.T. was the possession of the Christian Society, and it is the experiences of the N.T. at the hands of Christian scribes and Christian scholars that form the subject-matter of our enquiry.'¹ In the same way, Dr. Rendel Harris, in an article in the *Expositor*² which came out just before the last war, and on that account received much less attention than it deserved, developed some hints already dropped in his *Angus Lectures* regarding the text of the N.T. and some of the most vital controversies on the field of doctrine which divided the Church in early centuries. He, also, opened on this note by pointing out that the Textual Criticism of the N.T. is on one side 'a mere algebra of the combinations of the various alphabets', and on the other, 'it is a study which is as full of interest and of meaning as Church History itself, to which it properly forms a literary pendant, and without which it often cannot be understood'.

Dr. Rendel Harris has illustrated his method of inquiry by taking four passages in which important groups of MSS. preserve readings that may well be attributed to the influence of controversial theology. He then deduces from these the principle: 'That the history of the text must be read side by side with the history of the Church, and in the light of the various parties into which the Church was divided.'

The four passages are:

(a) Luke iv. 16. 'And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up, and entered according to his custom on the sabbath day into the synagogue, and rose up to read.' Some important Western texts, including the Codex Bezae, have omissions of words or phrases in this verse. Thus the

¹ *J.T.S.*, vol. x, p. 13. See also pp. 161ff., 354ff., vol. xi, pp. 1ff., 180 ff.

² *Expositor*, viii, vii, pp. 316ff.

Bezan text omits the statement about Christ's being brought up at Nazareth, also the word 'his' before 'custom'. Now Tertullian taxes Marcion with asserting that Christ suddenly appeared from heaven in one of the Galilean synagogues. If in Marcion's text these words stood, with the allusion to the boyhood of Jesus in Galilee and His sabbath custom of synagogue worship, he could have been convicted from his own Gospel. These words must therefore have been cut out, and the mutilated text has left its mark on D, and the three old Latin MSS., a, c, and e. In other words, these authorities have been Marcionized. That means that in circles where Marcion's blue pencil was no sceptre of authority, the trail of his editorial policy is discernible.

(b) John i. 34. The Baptist's testimony: 'And I have seen and have borne witness that this is the Son of God.' So reads the familiar text. But there is very strong MS. evidence in favour of another reading, 'the Elect of God'. Harnack¹ shows that this variant finds support in three different directions: viz. the original hand of the Sinaitic Codex, with two cursives and almost certainly the third-century fragment from Oxyrynchus, **p**⁴, representing Greek authorities; the Lewis and the Curetonian, representing the old Syriac; and several of the most valuable of the Old Latin MSS. With such strong and varied support this reading cannot be lightly dismissed. The word is never found elsewhere in John, and in the N.T. only in two passages in Luke, in xxiii. 35, where the rulers taunt the Crucified with the words, 'He saved others, let him save himself, if this is the Christ of God, the Elect'; and in ix. 35 where at the Transfiguration the Divine voice, according to some important MSS. and versions, says, 'This is my chosen Son', or 'This is my Son, the Elect'.

I must not stop here to link up the various indications that the Lucan Bath Qol at the Baptism (in the Codex Bezae) 'Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee', is related both to the Johannine report of the Baptist, 'I have seen and

¹ *Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche*, i. 128.

have borne witness that this is the Elect of God', and to the Lucan Bath Qol heard against Hermon's whitest snow, 'This is my Son, the Elect'. The immediate point is that we have evidence of a conflict in the textual tradition that exactly corresponds with what Rendel Harris calls the Ebionite movement. This left its mark in the debates between Christians and Jews (of which Justin's friendly discussion with Trypho is an outstanding example), or we may connect it with what Harnack regards as the Adoptianist stage in early Christology, corrected later on in the teaching of the Church and the revision of the text.

(c) The much discussed passage, Luke xxii. 43-44, recording the appearance of the angel in the garden and the bloody sweat, which Westcott and Hort placed in double brackets and regarded as an early Western interpolation, is regarded by Rendel Harris and Harnack as a genuine part of the Gospel with the hall-mark of Luke's style upon it. Dr. Harris accounts for its omission by its detailed description of the agony, so intolerable to the Docetists with their phantom, non-suffering Christ. Hort, in his famous note¹ on the reading, remarks that 'the suitability of these verses for quotation in the controversies against Docetic and Apollinarist doctrine gives some weight to their apparent absence from the extant writings of Clement, Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Gregory of Nyssa. Their controversial use led to gratuitous accusations of wilful excision; as by (timid) "orthodox persons" according to Epiphanius, by "some of the Syrians" according to Photius, and by the Armenians according to late writers'.

(d) The most remarkable instance given by Rendel Harris is the excision of the prayer on the Cross, Luke xxiii. 34, 'Father forgive them; for they know not what they do'. This saying, which bears every internal evidence of authenticity, is placed in double brackets by W-H, and is described by them as a Western interpolation of limited range. It is extremely difficult to believe that it formed a part of the original text

¹ *App.* ², pp. 64ff.

of Luke, for it is omitted not only by the first corrector of Aleph, and by the Vatican Codex, but also by the Bezan Codex in both Greek and Latin, by two important Old Latin MSS., as well as by the Coptic versions. Since the time of W-H the three most influential witnesses which have turned up, the Lewis Syriac, the Washington Codex, and the Kori-dethi MS., all agree with our other authorities which omit. The opinion generally held is that here we have a very early bit of genuine floating tradition, which afterwards found anchorage in St. Luke's Gospel. To Dr. Harris, however, this is an example of textual expurgation, 'provoked by the anti-Judaic polemic, arising very early in the history of the Church, and involving an actual abrenunciation of all fellowship with Jews'.

Of these four illustrations Dr. Harris puts this last example chronologically first, but places all four probably in the first half of the second century. The obvious danger of this method is that we should start with certain controversies and look for textual phenomena which will fit into our expectations of what ought to have happened. Let us then leave the question open whether ecclesiastical orthodoxy removed dangerous anomalies from the text of the canonical scriptures, or, on the other hand, heresies projected themselves into the very text of the New Testament so that innocent copyists preserved additions or subtractions or emendations without knowing the tainted source of their readings. It will be better to take a few striking examples where passages of considerable doctrinal import reveal an ambiguous textual history.

We may begin with the notorious example with which this paper opened. It is now established beyond any possibility of doubt that the verse containing the Three Heavenly Witnesses originated in Spain and was soon found in Africa and that the latest date is the second half of the fourth century. The attempt to affiliate the text to Priscillian has failed.¹ The

¹ Harnack, *op. cit.*, pp. 151f.; E. Riggenbach, *Das Comma Johanneum* (Gütersloh, 1928); A. E. Brooke, *The Johannine Epistles*, pp. 154-65; H. Windisch, *Die Katholischen Briefe*, 2nd ed., p. 133.

point of special interest is that though the words might seem likely to find ready acceptance when once they had spread, they are not to be found in the earliest and best texts of the Latin Vulgate. Yet such is the indifference of the Roman Church to the most elementary considerations of textual history that the authenticity of the famous verse was vouched for by the decision of the Index Congregation of January 13, 1897, presumably because it was printed in the Sixtine and the Clementine editions of the Vulgate in 1590 and 1592 respectively. It will be remembered, by the way, that when the Sixtine Vulgate was published, it was accompanied by a papal bull, which declared it to be the 'true, legitimate, authentic, and indubitable' text of the Holy Scriptures, which alone was to be regarded as authoritative. Two years later His Holiness, Clement VIII, decreed the recall and suppression of his predecessor's edition, in spite of its unusually high attestation, and the Clementine Vulgate was issued with some 3000 modifications, of which unhappily, the Comma Johanneum was not one.

If this example serves to show how the early Church could resist the temptation to adopt a doubtful reading which offered considerable controversial advantages, the other great 'proof-text' for the doctrine of the Trinity has a very different textual history. Thirty-eight years ago, the first number of the *Hibbert Journal* contained a striking article by the late Dr. F. C. Conybeare, which brought forward impressive reasons for doubting the authenticity of the words at the close of St. Matthew's Gospel containing the Lord's command to baptize into the Triune Name. If MS. witness alone were available there is not a shred of evidence against the well-known text. But this is the remarkable factor which Mr. Conybeare brought to light. Eusebius of Caesarea quotes Matthew xxviii. 19 at least eighteen times in the form, 'Go ye into all the world and make disciples of all nations in my name'. These eighteen passages have since been increased to twenty-five. Against them only four citations of the text by Eusebius

can be set which contain the words in dispute, and two of these occur in a work which was probably wrongly attributed to Eusebius. Even if the two rather doubtful exceptions were able to prove that Eusebius was aware of another reading, we could not lightly dismiss as meaningless the fact that so learned a Christian scholar, writing in one of the greatest Christian libraries of the age, when Christological controversy was at its height, would quote the great commission as he almost invariably does unless that form of the text was the one with which he was the more familiar.

This leads on naturally to Professor Kirsopp Lake's inaugural lecture at Leiden University,¹ which followed closely upon Conybeare's article and was intended to supplement it. After referring to the argument from Eusebius that throws grave doubt on the command to baptize recorded in Matthew as a word of the Lord, he reminds his hearers that the only other explicit reference to baptism on the lips of Christ is found in the spurious ending to Mark. If then we find reason to believe that there was a tendency on the part of very early scribes to insert in the text of the Gospels a reference to baptism, may we not look further? It is generally recognized that our Lord's conversation with Nicodemus has an unmistakably sacramental colour. This is entirely due to John iii. 5. 'Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' Dr. Lake thinks that the words 'water and' break the symmetry of the verses and the force of the argument, for elsewhere in the context the requirement is to be 'born anew', or to be 'born of the Spirit'. Be that as it may, he comes nearer to convincing us when he points out that when Justin Martyr describes the regeneration of converts, which he associates with baptism in the name of the Trinity, he gives three reasons. First he quotes for the necessity of regeneration these words: 'For Christ said, Except ye be born again ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.' For the act of baptism as cleansing away sin he quotes Isaiah i. 16-20, and

¹ *The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the N.T.* (Oxford, 1904).

for the Trinitarian formula he quotes tradition. It is hard to resist the conclusion that if Justin's text of the Gospels contained an allusion to baptism in either Matthew xxviii. 19 or in John iii. 5, he would not have come so near as John iii. 3 and 4, without going on to verse 5 to clinch his argument.¹

While speaking about textual evidence for the dominical institution of the Sacraments one could not be silent about the well-known fact that textual criticism has left us not a word in the Gospels to establish the institution of the Eucharist as a rite to be repeated, for the removal of the words in Luke xxii. 19-20, which W-H enclosed in double brackets, certainly has that result. Let it not be supposed, however, that this in any way affects our ground for believing in the historicity of the institution, since these words have been imported into Luke from 1 Corinthians xi. 23-25, and Paul is our earliest witness by many years, and he expressly declares that he has delivered over to the Corinthians the tradition which he himself had received as coming from the Lord. We are merely concerned to observe the tendency on the part of scribes to insert in the text of the Gospels what they knew to be established in the belief and practice of the Church.

How far has this tendency asserted itself in the manuscript tradition where the Person of Christ is involved? Beyond those indications which were dealt with when Dr. Rendel Harris's theory was described, we may mention two places where the doctrine of the Virgin Birth seems to have struggled to find expression. In Matthew i. 16 the reading supported by the great uncials is 'Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ'. There are two alternatives to that. (a) Most of the Old Latin texts, the Curetonian Syriac, four cursives, and the Armenian version read, 'Jacob begat Joseph, him to whom was betrothed the Virgin Mary who bare Jesus Christ'. (b) the Lewis Syriac reads 'Jacob begat Joseph. Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the

¹ R. Bultmann, in Meyer's *Kommentar* (1938), p. 98, on subjective grounds, regards these words, as also Jn. vi. 51b-58, as later insertions due to an ecclesiastical redaction of the Gospel.

Virgin, begat Jesus called the Christ.' The most that can be said of these alternatives is that they seem to point to some stage in the text when the doctrine so clearly involved in the context was not unambiguously expressed in this verse. On the other hand in John i. 11-14 we find a different phenomenon. Here the entire range of the Greek evidence is for the accepted reading, 'To them who believe on his name, who *were* born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God'. But one Old Latin text, the Veronensis, has the singular for the plural, 'To them who believe on his name, who *was* born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God'. Nor is that all. Irenaeus¹ and possibly Justin² bear witness to the existence of this Western reading, and Tertullian³ not only adopts it, but declares that the common text (with the plural verb) was invented by the Valentinians. In spite of the support which Blass, Loisy, Resch and Zahn give to the early Latin form of the text with the verb in the singular, and of Harnack's ingenious suggestion that the words, with the singular verb, were a marginal gloss by members of the Johannine school written in the margin and afterwards incorporated into the text, there is everything to be said for the common reading. It is entirely in accord with the Johannine teaching, and if the other reading were original it is hard to understand why it should have been corrected, and the correction should have been almost universally received. At any rate, the doctrine of the Virgin Birth was almost universally accepted long before the time when Tertullian cites the words in that interest. Nevertheless, so palpable a reading in support of the doctrine of the Church was set aside and all the Greek copyists and most of the Latin and Syriac scribes followed the harder reading. Let this be counted to them for righteousness! But little time remains, so we must briefly note two or three places where slender traces remain of an almost forgotten

¹ III. 16, 2; 19, 2; 21, 5; v. 1, 3.

² *Dial.*, 63, also 61; cf. 54; 76; 1, 2; *Apol.* I. 22, 32.

³ *De Carne Christi*, 19, 24.

reading whose rising or falling may have been due to dogmatic interests.

(a) 1 John iv. 2. 'Every spirit which confesseth Jesus Christ as come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus is not of God: and this is the spirit of the antichrist.' For 'confesseth not' the R.V.mg. reads 'Some ancient authorities read "annulleth Jesus".' But the Latin *solvit* which is found quoted by Irenaeus and other Fathers, represents the Greek λύει which is now proved to have been a reading known to Origen. But the meaning of this is rather 'dissolves' or 'separates', i.e. 'which separates the divine from the human, which divides the one divine-human Person'. As A. E. Brooke says: 'Neither reading can be later than Irenaeus, and at that date there could have been no motive for the alteration of λύει if it had been the original reading. On the other hand, the correction of μὴ ὁμολογεῖ into λύει would give special point to the passage as a condemnation of a particular form of heresy, which at that time had to be combated.'

In a lecture given by Harnack not long before his death, and published in 1929, he brought forward for examination two ancient dogmatic corrections, as he claimed to prove that they were, from the Epistle to the Hebrews.

(b) Hebrews ii. 8-10. 'For in that he subjected all things unto him, he left nothing that is not subject to him. But now we see not all things subjected to him. But we behold him who hath been made for a little while lower than the angels, even Jesus, because of the suffering of death crowned with glory and honour, that by the grace of God he should taste of death for every man.' This *locus classicus* for the humiliation of Christ may well seem to us to be in perfect accord with the message of the Epistle as a whole. But Harnack points out that against the overwhelming mass of documentary evidence must be set the consideration that in the majority of MSS. known to Origen while he was still writing in Alexandria the reading was not 'by the grace of God', but 'apart from God'. Westcott and Hort presumed a simple slip in copying from

χάριτι to χωρίς. Harnack sees rather the same kind of change which led to the suppression in some texts of the Lucan account of the agony in the garden.

(c) Hebrews v. 7-9. 'Who in the days of his flesh, having offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and having been heard for his godly fear, though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and having been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation.' Here, without the slightest patristic or documentary support, Harnack¹ suspects that the negative has been dropped out ('not having been heard'), by deliberate action of the copyist at a very early stage, no doubt with the confident belief that his predecessor had inadvertently omitted it from his text. Harnack would thus link these two passages with those found elsewhere in which the textual tradition reveals a tendency for a reverent refusal to probe into the awful significance of the Saviour's sense of dereliction, whether 'in the garden secretly', or 'on the cross on high'.²

The most favourable verdict we can pass on Harnack's thesis is 'Not proven'. But something has been gained if we discern in many of the textual variants in our manuscript tradition signs of a keen intellectual concern for the deposit of the truth. The 'faith once for all delivered to the saints' was not buried in the ground. The incessant controversies about the person of our Lord bear witness to the way in which those 'trusty bankers' of the early Church brought their treasure into the currency of the contemporary world, 'proving all things, holding fast that which was good'. The Church did not suffer from mental inertia. Some of its experiments were too adventurous and a more cautious policy was then demanded. The history of the first four centuries of Christian thought is

¹ Harnack suggests that the structure of contrast is the same as that found in another passage in this epistle where a concessive clause follows a negative, and compares Hebrews, v. 7, καὶ οὐκ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας, καίπερ ὦν υἱός, with xii. 17, μετανοίας τόπον οὐχ εὗρεν, καίπερ μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας αὐτήν.

² The early third-century Chester Beatty papyrus (p⁴⁶) is against Harnack in both passages from Hebrews.

largely a record of the tension between the liberal and the conservative elements at work in the doctrinal formulation of the tradition and experience of the Church's Lord and Saviour.

The history of the text of the New Testament provides a small commentary upon that period of mental strife.

WILBERT F. HOWARD

AN IMPRESSION OF KIERKEGAARD

THE classical example of melancholy in literature is Hamlet. Kierkegaard more than once refers to Hamlet and acknowledges a psychological affinity with him. Both are natives of Denmark though Hamlet belongs to a legendary rather than to an historical past, while Kierkegaard was born early in the nineteenth century. Both suffered the tortures of a divided self, both inherited a destiny of inward unrest and painful self-accusings and both were men of intellectual vigour and capable of supreme achievement in the world of thought if in the world of action their energies suffered frustration and defeat. *Either—Or* is the title of one of Kierkegaard's earlier works of self-revelation and is eloquent of the perpetual conflict of alternatives within his soul; 'to be or not to be'; submission or rebellion, action or inaction—which issues in the tragedy of melancholy or madness. Such a temperament which psychologically may be described as abnormal, necessarily encounters a prejudice against the value of its contribution to the realms of truth, beauty, and goodness. In the case of Kierkegaard, students and critics of his works with one consent plead, and we believe with justice, that the circumstances of his life tended to enrich rather than impoverish his individuality and his gifts, as a writer on the meaning and value of life when interpreted from the standpoint of the Christian religion.

In recent years many of his works have been translated and latterly the Oxford Press has produced his *Discourses* in an attractive form, edited by his biographer, Dr. Walter Lowrie of Princeton, and also his *Journals* in a selection edited and translated by Alexander Dru. Other smaller works by various translators have preceded these with the result that the British student can now form a fairly adequate opinion of the value of his contribution to Christian thought.

If one may venture on an impression of his personality and

achievement—and nothing more is attempted in what follows—we have to begin with those personal experiences which left a permanent mark on his nature and affected his whole career.

The first was his relationship with his father, trustful and affectionate, though he was treated 'as an old man'; but later it was disturbed by what he called 'the great earthquake', the confession of parental weakness culminating in 'a cursing of God', which deepened his melancholy already, as he says, 'prodigious': the second was the breaking of his engagement with Regine Olsen, owing to a personal scruple the nature of which was unrevealed: the third was his quarrel with Goldschmidt, the editor of the *Corsair*, a popular periodical to which Kierkegaard was a distinguished contributor, and finally, the strain in his relationship with Bishop Mynster, pastor of his father and his family, ending unfortunately in an attack on Martensen, the Bishop's successor. Towards the end of his life, nearly all of which was spent in Copenhagen, changes in the political framework of Denmark consequent on the loss of the provinces of Schleswig and Holstein, deepened his gloom.

These determining factors in the course of a short life of just over forty years are narrated in the *Point of View*, perhaps in small compass the most revealing of his minor works. But if we turn to a consideration of his work as thinker and writer, we have to answer the question, what was his real contribution to Christianity? He could not accept orders in the Christian ministry, wonderfully qualified though he was for the sacred office, but he remained to the end a Christian teacher detached from the national Church while maintaining a friendly relationship with his bishop, until, as we have noted, near the end of his life. Apart from the personal scruple of conscience, he had a further difficulty, the struggle between the aesthetic and the religious elements of his nature. It is obvious that he had remarkable gifts of poetic taste and insight combined with an acute reasoning faculty, which lent distinction to his treatment of questions of philosophy and religion. In the end the conflict was resolved in favour of religion and his aesthetic

faculties were henceforth to be subordinated to the superior claims of religion. His aim was to liberate Christianity from Christendom.

There is nothing new in this aim or the temper which produces it. In all ages there has been a strain of noble and sincere idealism which has reacted from certain features of the official or authoritarian Christianity of church or sect to what has been recognized as the purer witness in life and conduct of the mind of Christ and the New Testament. It is the spirit of inquiry which has produced reformers, heretics, sectaries, and schismatics. New orders have been founded and have been blessed or banned by authority. Whether the new thought has been accepted or condemned, the witness of the thinker has not been in vain if he has retained his sincerity, and his motive has been proved to be pure and free from the element of self-seeking. It may be that in a world of imperfect beings, subject to inevitable changes in the social, political, and racial readjustments of the world, the ideal Church will never be realized, but the witness of those who stand apart from its corporate life is never to be ignored. To this order belongs Kierkegaard and there are features in his work as teacher, expositor, and saint which are permanently illuminating.

It is interesting to find that Kierkegaard as a teacher regarded Socrates as the source of his inspiration in the method adopted in pursuit of truth.

Socrates loved the young and why?; Because there is a breath of eternity in them and that is what he wished to preserve. (*Journals*, p. 498.)

In his *Philosophical Fragments* (translated by Professor Swenson, Minnesota), a charming series of essays, he points out that Socrates proceeding by way of ignorance and assuming that the truth was already in man, professed to act as a midwife, not a begetter, a function which belonged to God alone. By using this maieutic method he exposed the weakness of the sophists, and beginning with the working man brought him to a knowledge of himself as a starting-point towards that

knowledge of God which was potential in his mind. The value of the Socratic dialectic remained, even if his conclusion that knowledge is the chief good is open to serious question. For one thing, Socrates had only a shadowy view of man's future destiny and here Plato completes his vision. According to Kierkegaard, his practice of the teacher's love for the disciple foreshadows the perfection of the Christian conception of God as Teacher and Saviour. God in Time is therefore the real answer to man's need: for His Love is

a love of the learner and his aim is to win him: for it is only in love that the unequal can be made equal and it is only in equality and unity that an understanding can be effected. (p. 19).

And at this point Kierkegaard works out his theme by means of a parable—the love of a king for a humble maiden—with the poetic insight and delicacy of touch of which he is a master. He ends with the thought that the Teacher suffers by reason of his love which desires to be the equal of the humblest, and finally when God implants himself in human weakness, man, if he is to become a new vessel and a new creature, must undergo the pangs of this becoming or new birth, as the earthen vessels that break asunder when the seed of the oak is planted in them.

Kierkegaard's gifts as an expositor are revealed in the numerous sermons which prove him to be a real preacher, if he never fulfilled the duties of a pastoral charge. He was keenly alive to the anxieties of human life and yet conscious of the joy that is the fruit of suffering patiently endured. He was a sound exegete of Scripture and offers enlightening explanations of difficult texts. A number of Communion addresses and discourses on 'The Lilies of the Field' and 'The Birds of the Air' are included in the volume of *Christian Discourses* translated by Dr. Lowrie. Yet it would appear that in such self-revealing documents as *Fear and Trembling* and the *Point of View* we get closer to the man himself. The former is a study of the temptation of Abraham. He never refers to any view of this incident such as a modern critic

might suggest to the effect that the story may mark a turning-point in Hebraic practice and the final condemnation of human sacrifice as a blasphemy against Jahweh. He treats it simply as a record revealing the absoluteness of God's claims—God claims absolute love—and he recalls the passage in Luke xiv. 26, 'If any man come unto me and hate not his father' . . . etc., on which he comments:

There is an absolute duty towards God . . . or else there had never been faith because it has always existed, or else Abraham is lost, or else the text in Luke might be interpreted in the elegant manner of the exegete. . . .

Again

Abraham believed and therefore he remained young; for he who always hopes for the best, becomes old, deceived by life and he who is always prepared for the worst, grows old early; but he who believes preserves eternal youth.

He states another paradox when he says:

It is a great thing to seize the eternal but a greater thing to abide steadfastly by the temporal, after having surrendered it.

Reference has already been made to the *Point of View* which was published after his death. He disliked a refined and intellectual paganism with a dash of Christianity. In fact he renounced a career which would have given scope to his acknowledged aesthetic gifts of lyricism, literary taste, and penetrating criticism, and henceforth became a religious writer. The *Journals* are valuable records, inasmuch as they set forth in chronological order the history of his inner life, so that we can trace its development under the stress of events. Brought up as a member of the Reformed State Church of his country, he was never to take orders, as his brother Peter Christian did, but remained obdurate to all suggestions of official service within the ecclesiastical fold. He was a critic both of Protestantism and Catholicism, while deeply interested in the problem of living the Christian life. He does not appear to have been specially concerned with the history of the Christian Church or with the developments of

dogmatic theology and never attempts a rationale of the Trinity and the Incarnation, though always illuminating in his references to both. His chief characteristic is his passionate sense of the value of individual soul. When he was twenty-six years old, he wrote:

perhaps it is possible through constant zeal to get to know definitely after a number of years what it means to be a Christian but whether one is so one-self can never be definitely known; it must be believed and in faith there is always fear and trembling.

The last phrase is often on his lips as well as being the title of one of his works and is characteristic of the personal humility of spirit which informs all his studies of the inner life. If one may express a personal preference, his discourses entitled *Purify Your Heart* (translated by A. S. Aldworth and W. S. Ferrie, London, 1937) are a striking example of his gift of spiritual analysis and place an evangelical emphasis on confession and repentance towards the attainment of an undivided will, as the condition of purity of heart. He rejects all ulterior motives, e.g. reward, fear of punishment, self-will, for the sake of victory, or what is most common, willing the good up to a certain point. Here are a few quotations:

Prayer does not change God but changes him who prays . . . God does not learn anything because thou dost confess but thou who confessest dost come for the first time to a knowledge of much else thou mightest have hidden in obscurity by telling the Omniscient of it . . . (p. 38).

Repentance must be the act of a collected mind that can dwell on it for its own edifying and so produce new life from itself and not become merely an event of which the forlorn survival is a mood of plaintiveness (p. 31).

In a fine passage he dwells on the power of silence. But not the silence of the woods, or of the sea which has great depth in it and knows well what it knows but confides in no one, nor of the stars which are so far away that they cannot see the traveller and thus there is no understanding between them.

He who confesses is gripped by the silence, not however by the pathos of an illusion but by the solemnity of the eternal . . . And the One who is present is an Omniscient being who at the man's last moment will

remember again this hour, both what he confided to him and what he withheld from his confidence (p. 37).

Finally he says

in eternity there is no most distant suggestion of a common shipwreck, in eternity the individual, thou, my hearer, and I myself, shall be asked as an individual, each alone and by himself, about his own individual life.

This stress on individual responsibility strikes a note that used to be familiar in the preaching of the evangelical revival but is rarely heard to-day and raises the question whether it is vital or otherwise in the present age. Soren Kierkegaard had no doubt of its relevancy in the search for purity of heart. He preached what he believed and even at the age of twenty-two declares like a mature observer that people postpone the decisive step because Christianity is a radical cure. Three years later there occurred in his life an experience of 'indescribable joy' which was never forgotten in the years of gloom which succeeded it. His life was to close in ever-deepening gloom. Suffering from the effects of a fall in childhood, partially crippled, shambling and uncertain in his gait, with an outward appearance that in public made him an object of ridicule and caricature, he recalled the apostle, whose bodily presence was by his critics judged to be weak and his speech of no account. But like him in weakness he was made strong. It is indeed tragic to recall his closing years, a broken man, the victim of melancholy, estranged by controversy from the head of the Church and Martensen his successor, then dying from the effect of a sudden physical collapse at the age of forty-one in the year 1855.

It is one of life's unresolved mysteries that so often a noble soul has been enshrined in an afflicted body, and if in the course of years there is decay of the mental powers, the burden of existence is heavy indeed. It is painfully obvious that Kierkegaard suffered from an incurable melancholy throughout his life and therefore was debarred even from the average share of human happiness; but his mind retained its

native vigour and his spirit was ever in contact with the Eternal and open to the Divine light. He never lost the vision of God and though what we term happiness was denied him, he makes us realize that he had found a nobler thing, that is joy, the joy which is the gift of the Holy Spirit and abides unquenched by the tribulations of this life.

R. MARTIN POPE

MATTHEW PARKER

THE Tudor period, more than any other in our history, presents us with a brilliant pageant. The figures rise before us with colourful, sometimes with tragic, meaning—Wolsey, the last English medieval statesman who was also a Prince of the Church. More, with his quips and asceticisms; old Hugh Latimer, with his crowd-shaking oratory; Cranmer, whose voice lives for ever in the Liturgy; calculating Cecil; the dashing Devon men, Leicester, Essex; Kit Marlowe and Shakespeare. But who, in seeing that pageant, keeps a watchful eye for the coming of Matthew Parker? Everyone knows he was Elizabeth's first archbishop; everyone has alternately sniggered and shivered at the queen's snub to his wife as she bade her farewell at Lambeth—'And you, Madam I may not call you, and Mistress I am ashamed to call you, so I know not what to call you, but yet I do thank you.' In spite of the eminence of his position in critical days for Church and people, he is little known. The man in the street could recognize Henry VIII or Elizabeth, Wolsey or Drake—but even among the clergy of the Church for which, in the words of the present Archbishop of Canterbury, Parker is 'the vital link', he is generally unknown.

The reason for this may well be that Parker was intended by Nature for good, solid tasks in a less perilous age than that in which he had to live. He should have been one of that great army of mankind's best servants who serve their generation faithfully in religion, scholarship, and administration and whose portraits remain in their college halls, but posterity at large knows nothing of them. Indeed, it could be argued that that is precisely what a good archbishop should be rather than a brilliant or tragic figure. Parker had some prescience of this, and it was against his own desire and better judgement that he came to be the Primate of All England by command of his queen and at the strong advice of her two sturdy henchmen

and adroit politicians, Mr. Secretary Cecil and the Lord Keeper Nicholas Bacon—both of whom were junior to him at Cambridge, Bacon being of his own college, Corpus Christi.

It is easier to assess his temperament—retiring, with readier utterance by pen than by speech in later life, and shrewdly careful—than to see his character clearly. The latter difficulty is due to the fact that he was outshone on the stage by a couple of more brilliant actors—the queen herself and Cecil—and because he was cordially detested by the men who held extreme opinions, either Romanist or Protestant—and they were much in the majority when he was Primate. He was, without doubt, in many senses a victim of circumstance; yet he was not a weak man and he did some things for which Englishmen should be eternally grateful. In an age of lavish dress and scintillating talk, he walked with gravity, donnish in taste, methodical in business—heavy-jowled, a man of fact, not fancy. He left abundance of information about himself and his times—letters and documents, most of them having been printed. But the most accessible, copious source of information is in old John Strype's volumes, to whom he appeared as a worthy successor to Cranmer. Strype published his *Life and Acts of Matthew Parker* in 1711, one of the four biographies—or, rather, chronicles full of detail and painstaking research, for he rarely obtrudes a comment or judgment—in which he recorded 'The Lives and Acts (as far as my Collections will serve me) of the Four First Holy Archbishops of Canterbury, those Wise and Painful, Just and Good Governors of this Reformed Church of England'. An American daughter of the Anglican Communion has recently written a pleasant narrative in which the portrait of Parker is attempted and that of Margaret, his wife.¹ This book, which derives from a remark made by Dr. Lang, that Parker was 'the vital link' takes less note of the major events of the time than of the domestic scene and the archbishop at his happiest tasks of

¹ *Under Four Tudors, being the true story of Matthew Parker and Margaret*, by E. Weir Perry (Allen & Unwin).

ordering the estates and buildings of his various offices. But it is chiefly for the freshness brought in by the discovery of Margaret as wife and housekeeper (beneath the notice and also to a great extent beyond the desire and range of Strype) that Mrs. Weir Perry's work will be esteemed. Parker in her volume is a late Victorian rather than an Elizabethan; the reader seems to see him alighting from a carriage with sleek, side-whiskered dignity. Where Strype boldly and certainly acclaim him as 'the Second Protestant Archbishop', eager for proper reform, his latest biographer sees him as a member of the Oxford Movement:

As one sums and weighs evidence, Archbishop Parker emerges, not as a man whose striking actions moved the Church this way or that, but for his integrity in preserving the faith. His record is of holding the pass, of defending positions, and maintaining a besieged Church against the onslaught of the Protestant revolution, keeping watch and ward over the deposit of faith entrusted to him.

Was Parker an ardent Reformer? Was he conscious of his position as 'the vital link'?

We believe that he was all too acutely aware of his duty as conservator of what was best and valuable in religion for England and in some respects he showed unexpected strength and resistance even to the queen—as in his defence of the married clergy (he was married himself) and of Church income (he was a first-rate business man). Yet on the whole, as he was chosen by Elizabeth, so he remained the instrument and loyal architect of an edifice which has proved to be of surprising stability, partly owing to the amazing pliancy of its structure, partly because of unique beauty which has grown upon it and is derived from not a few of the paradoxes inherent in its foundation as the best practical way of avoiding extremes. Parker undoubtedly was bitterly opposed to the Puritans at the end of his regime. He was definitely an anti-Papalist and a Reformer. But would he recognize himself as an Anglo-Catholic? It is very doubtful.

The points of chief interest in a career which has little adventure in it are his entry into the office of archbishop and

his work as a collector of books and manuscripts. As an author, though he wrote much he left nothing of fresh creative worth. But the story of the man himself is necessary. The clue to the kind of archbishop Elizabeth's counsellors wanted and got lies in the history of the man from his early days as a student until his consecration as the seventieth Archbishop of Canterbury in 1559.

Matthew Parker was born on August 6, 1504, when the first Tudor had been king for eighteen years. He died on May 17, 1575, in the twentieth year of Queen Elizabeth, a lonely, ill old man, the object of plots and hatred and with no very ardent following even among those who felt that the Elizabethan Settlement was the best temporary solution for those troubled times.

He came of good trading stock in the city of Norwich whence he went up to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. At the very outset of his career he revealed those qualities for which he was best revered—a love of good, painstaking scholarship, ability and watchfulness in administration, combined with honesty (no common virtue just then) and sincerely religious. As a young man he was of that little eager company which used to assemble in the dusk at The White Horse to discuss matters of Church Reform. Little Bilney, who was so instrumental in Latimer's conversion, was the chief moving spirit among these evangelical young dons—as he was certainly the first martyr. Here, 'in Germany' as it was called, a stone's throw from Corpus, he would meet Ridley, Coverdale, and Latimer. That Parker was definitely associated with these Reformers in spirit and action is attested by his journey in company with Bilney to his native city of Norwich where Bilney was burnt at the stake. Mrs. Weir Perry uses a curious sentence regarding this incident which she means to be laudatory but which becomes unintentionally a shrewd diagnosis of the man—'It convinced him also of the utter futility of martyrdom.' The futility of martyrdom! Certainly, in spite of his being 'of great stomach' in the defence of colleges

and Church income or the married clergy after Margaret was his wife, he had the temperament and disposition to bow to the blast on some significant occasions. Thus, however much he is to be praised for the way in which he insisted that his wife should be fully recognized and treated as 'Her Grace' at Lambeth and the undoubted success of his Mastership at Corpus whither he brought her as the first lady to begin the rites of hospitality for which Masters' Lodges have since become famous, it cannot escape one's eye that he bound her to himself in the years when he was pledged to celibacy and while Henry VIII was bitter against the marriage of the clergy.

The chief landmarks in his earlier career are that he became a priest and Fellow of his College in 1527; he was then 24 years of age and of such fine reputation as a student that he was selected with other Cambridge men for Wolsey's new and magnificent foundation at Oxford; he, however, with Cranmer and one or two others, yielded to friendly pressure and stayed in Cambridge. Five years later he preached for the first time before the University (Cranmer had just become archbishop) and thereafter he grew in fame as a preacher, 'commonly appointed to preach in the solemn time of Lent in the most public auditories; an office for which the best-learned preachers were sought out: on this occasion he preached often before King Henry VIII, King Edward VI and Queen Elizabeth'. When Henry's second consort, Anne Boleyn, required a new chaplain, Parker was appointed and was so successful in winning his mistress's favour that he was preferred to the Deanery of Stoke-by-Clare College which was in her gift. Some twenty miles from Cambridge, Stoke was a collegiate church for a dean, six secular canons, eight vicars, two clerks and five choristers. He improved both its spiritual and temporal functions, accepted a pastoral responsibility towards the little township, established a grammar school and thoroughly enjoyed this opportunity to develop his real instinct for college administration. He successfully defended this little foundation against the first encroachments of the royal

avarice, but in the reign of Edward VI Stoke joined the great host of the dissolved; yet the dean's sorrow was assuaged with an excellent pension. While Dean of Stoke and also Rector of Ashen in Essex, he was made Master of Corpus—and a very good Master he was, conspicuously able in everything he undertook, so that very soon he was called upon to serve two terms as Vice-Chancellor.

It was while Master of Corpus, then usually called St. Benet's, that he married Margaret Harlestone. This was immediately after Edward's accession and the repeal of 'the whip with six scourges'—the Six Articles Act. Parker was 43, his bride 28. In the contrast between their temperament and background (Margaret was of a good, landed family) this match recalls that between the Puritan Richard Baxter and the Royalist Margaret he married, though Parker was much more appreciative of a good table, earthly riches, and a well-ordered estate (in spite of his motto, *Mundus transit et concupiscentia ejus*). Margaret was a graceful, able lady, much more suited for Court life than her socially slow husband. So much was she admired by brother clerics in that time, when there was a general move towards the taking of partners, that even Ridley, who remained a celibate, was deeply impressed with Mrs. Parker's looks and bearing. 'He was heard to ask the question whether she had a sister like her? Either thereby congratulating Dr. Parker on such a wife, or as though he himself, notwithstanding his purpose of living in the single state, had been minded to change his resolution if he might meet such a woman as she was' (Strype). The ghosts of supposedly celibate medieval archbishops must have shivered with too long delayed pangs of conscience when they heard the cries of children at Lambeth. If the world, including the queen, could not adjust its ideas quickly, at least everyone had to acknowledge that this was a fully Christian home and the sacrament of marriage was justified every day in the household of the Primate. But before that happened there was joy and sorrow ahead. It was soon after Edward's coming to the

throne that the Master of Corpus rode off to the village of Mattishall in Norfolk to bring home his bride who had waited long years for him without any real certainty that a priest's marriage would ever be legal. The position she established for herself at Cambridge showed the possibility and propriety of marriage for Heads of Houses; it would be a far harder and very unhappy task for the 'Lady of Lambeth' when an unmarried queen who disliked the partners of all her ablest men became her guest and critic.

Parker was never physically robust. There is record of a strange 'grace' passed by the University authorizing him to preach with his head covered—a comment on Church temperatures! It was, however, either his native desire for a quiet life or dislike for the dangerous hazards of the time that made him shrink from accepting public responsibilities like preaching at Court or at Paul's Cross. He does excuse himself sometimes on grounds of ill-health, but he often adopted that annoying device, not unknown to charwomen, of not acknowledging requests which were unpleasant. He took no notice of letters, hoping it might be assumed he had never received them or else that his silence would discourage his superiors from pressing him. Having tried this naive trick in Cranmer's day, he would repeat it when the matter of his becoming archbishop was looming over the horizon. It is a slight but significant clue to the man's nature—a fault which indicated a personality that could be used by stronger wills, especially if backed by royal commands.

The few years of Edward VI's reign show Parker in his happiest circumstances. He was at his best in University clerical life rather than on the wider stage of national affairs, though once—the incident stands out like a solitary crocus in a city garden—he braved a rebels' camp to preach to them their duty to their king. The tide of reform was now flowing fast, too fast to attain lasting results; but there is nothing to indicate that Parker protested against any of the changes. His friendship for the famous refugee scholar Martin Bucer,

whom he helped with hospitality and influence, shows where his sympathies lay. Arguments from silence are notoriously unreliable, but the mere fact that Parker did not thrust himself to the front among those clamouring for extreme Protestantism does not prove him to be out of sympathy with reformers, religious or political. As far back as 1536, when Parker's reputation as a preacher was growing fast, Latimer had written to him urging him to come to the front, to 'show himself to the world':

Ostende te mundo. Delitescere diutius nolito. Operare bonum, dum tempus habes. Veniet nox, quum nemo poterit operari. Notum est quid potes, fac, non minus velis quam potes. Vale. Tuus of Worcester,

H. LATYMER

Now Latimer was not the man to waste words on anybody whose sympathies he doubted; he was most definitely the man to urge a shy or a nervous friend. He knew Parker's ability. Why did he not work as Latimer was working? Because he was calculating chances.

In 1553 came the devastation of Mary's accession—a flood of misfortune and misery descended in a night and swept away that world where Parker had been well content. The Church of England had swung its farthest to the left; it would now swing unhealthily, violently to the extreme right, pushed fanatically by the ill-starred daughter of Katherine of Arragon. It would remain for Anne Boleyn's daughter, with the aid of Parker, to check the resultant frenzies of extreme partisanship.

As soon as Mary became Queen, Parker resigned his Mastership. He did not wait to be expelled. Whether he would have resigned had he been single, is doubtful; but he was not single, and the queen knew it. By resigning he forestalled certain dispossession, perhaps physical harm. He went with Margaret and his family into hiding—where, no one knows, except that it was certainly in England. That he did not go abroad shows he was not eager to dash to Geneva with some of his friends; but he may not have gone because he could with fair safety lie

quietly in the country. Both he and Margaret had many friends in the eastern counties—and folk out of favour with Roman ways would get better sympathy there than in, say, Oxford or the west. Only once, so far as we know, was he in danger—when suddenly he had to ride away by night from agents inquiring for him, and fell from his horse, sustaining an internal injury which troubled him sorely and continuously for the rest of his days.

Yet Parker found much to content him in these days. He truly loved study and was now free from the cares of administration. Part of his leisure he employed in versifying the Psalms; but his Muse was, to put it mildly, pedestrian, as witness the following lines:

A joyful thing for men it is
The Lord to celebrate,
And Thy good Name, O God so high,
Due Lauds to modulate.
To preach and show Thy gentleness
In early morning light;
Thy truth of word to testify
All whole by length of night.

He also wrote a treatise in support of the marriage of the clergy which could not see the light of day until he issued it later when archbishop. His records show the grievous extent of his material loss and incidentally reveal that he was no better than many others of his time in the matter of pluralities, for in addition to his Mastership, he lost his rectory at Landbeach, a prebend at Ely, and the Deanery and another prebend at Lincoln. Many of his former Cambridge friends (for instance, Coverdale) were now overseas whence they would presently return more hotly in favour of a further reformation; some of his friends—Ridley and Latimer especially—would not consider martyrdom a futility. It is to Parker's insularity and quiet hiding in Mary's days that the Church of England owes some of its wide limits of accommodation. If his hostages to fortune, Margaret and her boys, certainly prevented him

from any swinging towards Rome, they may also have prevented his pilgrimage to Geneva.

But these six years aged Parker. When he was called to his highest office, he knew that his tide of vitality was on the ebb. In the autumn of 1558 England went mad for joy; the bonfires leapt high as though the very flames entered into the festivity of their innocent function after their tragic and constant use at the stake. The exiles came rushing home to merrier England, and 'our good Doctor issued out, as did many more learned and conscientious men, from his lurking hole with his wife and two children'.

Parker went to Cambridge. It was the place of his memories; he hoped it might be the scene of his future work. He wanted nothing better, certainly nothing more responsible than to be the Master of Corpus. That much is plain from his letters. Cambridge, he felt, needed him; and his constant interest in the University shows how genuine was his love for her. But it was not to be. He was almost immediately employed with others on the preparation of the Prayer Book for Parliament's approval, and in Lent he preached before the queen. What poignant memories stirred as he faced that young monarch, perched precariously on her throne? Would her queenship be as brief, as fatal, as her mother's? When he promised Anne, before her execution, that he would do all he could for her little daughter, he never dreamt those tiny hands would grow to such queenly imperiousness that they would thrust him to many a task for which he had small taste—that hers must always be the praise and his the blame, his, too, the inevitable expense in hard cash, for the queen could always spend her men's money.

With lightning speed the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity were passed. It was not Calais but Rome that had been most deeply written on Mary's heart; her sister saw to it that the Papal claims would have short shrift; and the too eager Reformers hastening home from Switzerland and Germany, they, too, should come to heel for all their high spirits and

burning convictions. But in this new order which most men thought could not last long, Parker should be her Primate, to do hard work driving an unruly, prejudiced clergy, sometimes to be a figurehead, sometimes only a whipping-boy.

It is difficult to see on that early Elizabethan landscape any other man who could have been chosen, though Parker himself stated the necessary qualifications for an archbishop and protested earnestly, pleaded abjectly that he was not the man. His earlier associations with Elizabeth and her mother, to say nothing of Bacon and Cecil, foredoomed him: they would not let him off. 'Mere English', as she was, the queen was not enamoured of the men who had spent their time of disfavour out of the country. Parker had scholarship, had been a favourite preacher, he had a fine administrative record, he was a conscientious steward. Added to this, he had always been loyal to the Crown. Was there something else? Did Cecil and Bacon know that he would never risk martyrdom, never go quite so far as to step irretraceably over some of the lines that would be drawn for him?

Parker, it seems, was one of the few people who really did believe in the Elizabethan Settlement; but what was the Elizabethan Settlement? We speak of it now as though it was something built up definitely and unalterably in a few short months. A swift perusal of Parker's many tasks, the parsimony of the queen, the prejudices which she would foster in a night and dismiss by noon, the schemes of Catholics in Court and Council, the plots of Puritans, the trouble about vestments, all combined to make him miserable. Add to this his increasingly sorry health and lack of success at Court where the Queen's greatest favourite—Leicester—detested him and used his influence against him.

Much is said to-day, particularly by those who would like to think that the Church of England in Elizabeth's time bore the same relation to the pre-Reformation Church in England as fruit does to its tree, that Elizabeth and her advisers first made quite sure of their own theological and doctrinal sound-

ness and then chose Parker because he embodied all that was ideal. The wish is father to the thought. What Dr. Inge once wrote about Newman's pathetic fallacy applies very largely to those who see in Parker a man chosen first with the intention of retaining the fullness of the Apostolic Succession for men who might in future be ordained by his command, and only secondly because of his other much more solid characteristics as esteemed by two very shrewd judges of men and the queen.

He imagined a golden age of the Church, or several golden ages, and found them in 'the first three centuries', in the time of Alfred the Great or of Edward the Confessor, or in the seventeenth century. He was only sure that the sixteenth century was made of much baser metal. This unhistorical idealisation of the past, even of a barbarous past, was very characteristic of Newman and his friends. They bequeathed to the Anglican Church the strange legend of an age of pure doctrine and heroic practice, to which it should be our aim to 'return'. The real strength of this legend lies in the fact that it has no historical foundation. The ideal which is presented as a return or a revival is nothing of the kind, but a creation of our own time, projected by the imagination into the past from which it comes back with a halo of authority. (W. R. INGE: 'Cardinal Newman'—*Outspoken Essays*)

Elizabeth's own personal convictions in religion seem to have been as mysterious and changing as her expressions regarding possible marriage alliances. The Protestant can find much to justify him in asserting that she was on his side; and the Catholic can with equal confidence point to her animosity for those who expressed contempt for some of the central Catholic doctrines and practices. Uniformity and compliance she insisted on, but retained in her own chapel practices more ornate and ritualistic which baffled her own most faithful bishops. The married clergy (or rather their wives) she disliked intensely; and Parker had to stand up stoutly against her on more than one occasion. He did his brethren good service in this respect, but to do otherwise would have been to deny Margaret her rightful place, and he was always manfully resolute in his care of her good name as his wife lest there should be any repetition of the whispering and gossip that went the rounds concerning Mrs. Cranmer. It may well have

been the desire to justify his own position that first set him seeking so earnestly for precedents, even though he had to go back to Saxon times and the pre-Conquest priests of the Church in England. But in the queen he had a woman as his 'Supreme Governor' (she refused the title of 'Supreme Head' of the Church though she never gave Parker or anybody else grounds for believing she thought herself to be anything less) and her religious position is summed up by Froude in words worth pondering:

Her own creed was a perplexity to herself and to the world. With no tinge of the meaner forms of superstition she clung to practices which exasperated the Reformers, while the Catholics laughed at their inconsistency; her crucifixes and candles, if adopted from a politic motive of conciliation, were in part also an expression of that half belief with which she regarded the symbols of the faith; and while ruling the clergy with a rod of iron, and refusing as sternly as her father to tolerate their pretensions to independence, she desired to force upon them a special and semi-mysterious character; to dress them up as counterfeits of the Catholic hierarchy; and half in reverence, half in contempt, compel them to assume the name and character of a priesthood which both she and they in their heart of hearts knew to be an illusion and a dream.

(FROUDE: *History*)

Parker was *her* archbishop, whatever he wanted to be and whatever men may now wish he might have been. His continual self-pity is not to be wondered at: he did his utmost in his limited sphere.

If Parker was chosen as archbishop elect almost immediately, he was not consecrated at once. And his consecration has been matter for continual debate. The unworthy Roman tale of his confirmation in a tavern, The Nag's Head, has long since been exposed. Whatever faults Elizabeth may have had, she would insist on authority being properly acknowledged and there was too much at stake to allow laxity. Parker was set to inquire into the proper procedure for his consecration and the queen issued letters patent to six of the bishops directing them to proceed to the confirmation. There was considerable delay, not a little reluctance and direct refusal by some of the bishops. In the end the four bishops

officiating were William Barlow, formerly Bishop of Bath and Wells, now elect of Chichester; John Scory, formerly of Chichester, now designated for Hereford; Miles Coverdale, who had been Bishop of Exeter but who, in Elizabeth's reign, did not return to the Bench; and John Hodgkin, Suffragan Bishop of Bedford. This does not seem a very imposing list. Some of the Marian bishops became Parker's compulsory guests by order of the queen but at Parker's charge, Lambeth Palace being the place of their detention. Of the four who consecrated him, it is interesting to notice that all had been Edwardian bishops, Barlow and Hodgkin had been consecrated according to the Sarum rite and Coverdale and Scory according to the Edwardian Ordinal. Cranmer, during whose archbishopric they were consecrated, had himself, of course, been consecrated in Henry VIII's time with full powers from Rome, the bishops officiating being York, Lincoln, Exeter, and St. Asaph. Since then Cranmer had been burnt as a heretic and, of the sixteen bishops in the sees at Elizabeth's accession, almost all had to be deprived for refusing to take the Oath of Supremacy. To say, therefore, as Mrs. Perry does, that 'Parker selected his four Bishops from the possible seven, as representative of the pre-Reformation Church, an extremely important fact', is yet another instance of the fallacy Doctor Inge noticed in Newman. Parker was consecrated by the four bishops who were willing to act—and there were not many willing. Of the four Coverdale, at least, was a returned exile of what would later be called Puritan views. They were truly representative of the new order in the English Church—but it is not to be wondered at that the Catholics were not convinced and the Puritans thought it unnecessary. There is no question of their validity as Ministers and that the spirit of the consecration was worthy of true servants of Christ's Church; but Strype has considerable justification for his quaint phrase concerning Parker as the 'Second Protestant Archbishop'. In the ceremony itself (the Edwardian Ordinal was used) there was a curious mixture of vestments just as in the Prayer

Book itself there is a curious mixture of the words 'Minister' and 'Priest'. Barlow wore a cope as he was to administer the Sacrament (but the cope, however magnificent, was not primarily a sacrificial garment like the chasuble). Parker himself wore a linen surplice, Scory and Hodgkin wore linen surplices, 'but Miles Coverdale had nothing but a long cloth gown'. Coverdale stuck to that 'long cloth gown'—a symbol of his exile and his views.

It is clear that Parker's appointment, its manner and purpose, was entirely in keeping with the political *via media* which Elizabeth sought. It was the best practical adjustment possible to the needs of the time. What Dr. Inge once wrote in another context can be used as a comment upon the Elizabethan Settlement: 'The Church of England has only one title to exist and it is a strong one. It may claim to represent the religion of the English people as no other body can represent it.' It is a good thing that at such a time Parker was chosen, for he was head and shoulders above his own bishops, and it is largely due to his tact and example that serious religious disorder was prevented. Later on, when this house of cards, as it appeared to not a few, revealed itself as a house built on rock, Parker would exhibit against the Puritans a harshness which charity cannot entirely excuse as a sign of his being outworn—though weariness and disappointment, loneliness and ill-health make men testy and imperious who in better days have been the very spirit of accommodation and understanding.

In his fifteen years as archbishop Parker gradually brought order out of chaos among the parishes and in the Establishment, conserving income, watching expenditure, regulating life, especially interested in education, just as he had done in the happier days at Stoke and at Corpus. In his private life he took great interest in the buildings and estates attached to his office and it is especially for his interest in books relating to the old days in England that we must ever be grateful to him. He employed men to search for old manuscripts and

rare books so many of which had been dispersed carelessly or deliberately destroyed, and if he learnt of the whereabouts of really important papers—as he did of Cranmer's writings—he would obtain orders from the Council to make their confiscators reluctantly disgorge them. Only a few years ago a letter from Parker was discovered bidding the Bishop of Hereford send to him certain old Saxon books which had been found—evidently as the result of investigation ordered by him. His watchers were vigilant on the Continent also. The great and valuable library he amassed he bequeathed to his old college with stringent conditions attached to the gift, that if any of the manuscripts should be missing at any time all the books were to revert to Caius. Knowing that silver appealed to some College Fellows more than many books, he attached a gift of plate and made provision for three keys to be kept by three different College authorities, all of whom were to be present when the library was opened. In this Parker Library are no less than thirty-seven Anglo-Saxon manuscripts and thirty-eight chronicles of English History, including the Winchester Anglo-Saxon chronicle and Matthew Paris's original manuscripts with his additions and notes.

How soon Parker's interest was aroused in the 'antiquities of England', no one can tell with certainty; but there is an interesting letter from Matthias Flacius Illyricus dated May 22nd, 1561, from Germany. It urges the archbishop to make it his business to rescue all manuscripts and rare books from their all too common fate at the hands of the ignorant, and presses the point that, at his death, Parker should bequeath them to public bodies. This is, in fact, what he did. Anything that threw light upon the life of England in Church and State appealed to him. At Lambeth he employed a small army of book-binders, copyists, and printers, had special type cut for the reproduction of Anglo-Saxon characters and specially sought pre-Conquest Bibles and homilies.

Flacius Illyricus was himself an ardent ecclesiastical antiquarian, keen to dig up evidence to refute the Papal

claims. Whether Parker's work was inspired by genuine love of all that revealed the condition of the older England or was only with the idea of establishing some sort of basis for arguments which seemed to lack historical justification and precedent, it is impossible to say. He certainly did proudly produce from Anglo-Saxon times examples and practices which matched his own.

The late Sir Archibald Hoskyns who was Dean of Chapel and Librarian of Corpus once preached on 'The Importance of the Parker Manuscripts', and pleaded that they were brought together.

to answer the charge of newfangledness and to awaken confidence in the Church of England . . . There were three charges for which the Church of England was most vehemently attacked as newfangled:

The general use of the Scriptures in English,
The discarding of the doctrine of Transubstantiation
and The marriage of the clergy.

Certainly on all these points the Anglo-Saxon documents could bring good evidence, and it was for the printing of *The Gospels of the Fower Evangelists translated in the Olde Saxons tyme out of Latin into the vulgare tongue of the Saxons* that Parker had the special type cut and John Foxe wrote a preface. But the main fact surely is, that Parker and his friends believed in the rightness of these religious tenets on far other and greater spiritual grounds, as belonging to New Testament practice and belief now happily rediscovered. The pre-Conquest English Church did, after all, depend for its chief origin and continuance upon Rome. Strype's little aside is important:—

Indeed the Archbishop took a pleasure sometimes to recollect how he was consecrated; and that he was the first of all the Archbishops of Canterbury that came into that see without any spot or stain of Popish superstitions and vain ceremonies required of all before him.

Parker could legitimately rejoice over these early illustrations of what he himself believed and practised; but the growth of his own belief had preceded and been quite independent of their discovery.

HAROLD S. DARBY

THE PEACE OF GOD: A PAULINE STUDY

THE Peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord'—who does not recognize the opening words of the longer form of benediction which ends an act of public worship? Most people hearing them would have no hesitation in ascribing their authorship to Paul, and some might add that they are a quotation from the Apostle's letter to his friends in Philippi, wherein they would be wrong, for Paul said something quite different. 'Always verify your references' is a sound rule for others beside professed scholars, and here is an outstanding example of a mistake so constantly repeated that its correction may well cause a shock of surprise to people who have been repeating these words, or hearing them, for half a lifetime or longer. What Paul actually wrote was 'And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall guard your hearts and your thoughts in Christ Jesus', which when examined carefully is, as we shall see, worlds away from the familiar form of benediction. True, the memorable phrase 'the peace of God, which passeth all understanding' appears in both passages, but what too often escapes notice is that Paul prefaced the phrase with 'and' and followed it with 'shall', and these are much more than verbal modifications. They transform what in the one case is a prayerful hope or pious aspiration into an assertion of triumphant certainty. Comply with the conditions laid down in the preceding sentences, says the Apostle in effect, and as surely as consequence follows from cause 'the peace of God *shall* guard . . .'

Thanks to the Revised Version, with its paragraph divisions superimposed upon the chapters and verses of the Authorized Version, we are able at a glance to see where to begin our study. We cannot tell whether Euodia, Syntyche, Clement, and 'the rest of my fellow-workers, whose names are in the book of life' suggested this particular counsel to Paul's mind, but we

can be sure that with the new paragraph we leave the incidental circumstances of the Philippian Church behind us, and pass into a sphere where geography and the passage of centuries mean less than nothing, so that Paul's words are as pertinent to us as to those who read them first. This is what Paul says: 'Rejoice in the Lord alway: again I will say, Rejoice. Let your forbearance be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand. In nothing be anxious; but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God. And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall guard your hearts and your thoughts in Christ Jesus.'

'Rejoice alway'—just as the words were being written here in a London suburb, the nightly air-raid was in progress; bombs were dropping, and the air resounded with our answering barrage. Was that compatible with joy, or did it provide its own mocking commentary on the futility of Christian faith in days like these? But Paul did not say 'Rejoice alway', but 'rejoice in the Lord alway', which is a very different thing. Even if he knew nothing of the horrors of modern war, he knew what it was to be a prisoner under Nero, and though the word had not yet been spoken which was to send him out to the place of execution on the Appian Way, he knew enough of man's devilry to cherish no fond illusion, nor cheat himself into a fool's paradise. To him, 'in the Lord' meant the same as the phrase which ends the paragraph, 'in Christ Jesus', both of them indicative of Paul's real habitation, where his spirit dwelt, independent of temporal circumstance. Years ago, a member of the Army of Occupation stationed in Cologne was fascinated by a picture in the art gallery there, and to this day a copy of it stands upon his study mantelpiece. It is the picture of a dungeon, deriving its only light from a lattice high up in one wall. Through that lattice two ugly faces leer, obviously deriding the prisoner, who stands back in a corner. He is looking, not at them, but at a ray of light which streams over their heads across the cell, and touches the edge of his

poor bed, and beyond it, a circle drawn by the prisoner's finger in the filth upon the floor. He is watching intently the passage of that ray across the circle. It is the great moment of the day for him, because it provides him with the data for a calculation in which the earth and the sun have a place, but in which there is no room for the ignorant grossness of his tormentors. To them he is Galileo in prison, but the world has long since decided that the thralldom of his persecutors held them in a closer bondage than any they could inflict upon him. Absorbed in the world of pure thought he was free, though manacles and fetters held his limbs, for

Stone walls do not a prison make,
Nor iron bars a cage.
Minds innocent and quiet take
That for an hermitage.

The joy within a Christian's heart finds its outward expression in a word which has baffled all English commentators to render adequately. Their attempts range from the 'moderation' and 'forbearance' of the two great versions to the 'gentleness' of the Revised marginal reading. Lightfoot contents himself with a contrast, and says that τὸ ἐπιεικὲς means 'the opposite to a spirit of contention and self-seeking'. Kennedy fortifies his rendering 'reasonableness' with a quotation from Pater's *Marius the Epicurean* describing 'a certain, debonair grace, and a certain mystic attractiveness or courtesy which made Marius doubt whether that famed Greek blitheness or gaiety or grace in the handling of life had been, after all, an unrivalled success'. The difficulty lies, not in understanding Paul's meaning, but in finding one English word rich enough to reveal the treasure that his word contains. May it not well be that in 1 Corinthians xiii he has painted full-length the picture of which 'your forbearance' is the miniature?

This is not the place to examine in detail Paul's expectation of the Lord's Second Coming, nor the modification which the years wrought in his belief in its imminence. That is a subject in itself, and only concerns us here in so far as 'The Lord is at

hand' throws light upon his assured sense of the peace of God which he wishes his Philippian friends to share. Whatever difference in viewpoint may be found between the earliest and latest of his letters, one certainty remains constant throughout—the sense of the immediate nearness of his Lord. In this Philippian context the statement is best understood as a statement of fact without any eschatological significance at all. He is dealing with the Christian's everyday life, and all that precedes as well as all that follows 'The Lord is at hand' is strengthened by that reminder of the Christian's guarantee of succour and support. From the far-away day on the Damascus road when he had heard the voice which said 'I am Jesus whom thou persecutest', right on to the moment which still lay ahead when he would write, 'Nevertheless the Lord stood by me and strengthened me', his faith in that Friend 'at hand' never wavered. The compasses might be readjusted so that the sweep of the circle might become ever larger, but the centre point remained unchanged from first to last.

If proof were needed that the simplest interpretation of 'The Lord is at hand' is, in this case, the best, it can be found in the word which immediately succeeds it—'In nothing be anxious', for the temptation to worry besets us all and is of the earth, earthy. Those who are fortunate enough still to possess a copy of Donald Hankey's last article in the *Spectator*, published in October, 1916, will agree that for them that essay, written within a few days of his death upon the battlefield, provides the best comment on Paul's word, though Hankey based his message upon the parallel passage in the Gospel 'μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν'—'The whole teaching of the Gospels is that we have got to find freedom and peace in trusting ourselves implicitly to the care of God. We have got to follow what we think right quite recklessly, and leave the issue to God; and in judging between right and wrong we are only given two rules for our guidance. Everything which shows love for God and love for man is right, and everything which shows personal ambition and anxiety is wrong.' How strangely

akin Hankey's comment is to Paul's advice, though the older man, with all the added experience that the years had brought him, saw no cause to speak of 'recklessness' in following what was right. At heart they are at one, and across the centuries two Christian soldiers, the one a veteran apostle, the other a second lieutenant in a British infantry regiment, join their testimony as to where the remedy for worry may be found.

If Grimm-Thayer is right, and *μερίμνω* is a derivative of *μερίζω, μερίζομαι* 'to be drawn in different directions', we have a valuable clue to the cause of worry, and to know the cause of a malady is a long step towards its cure. The worried man allows himself to be swayed by external circumstances, to be pulled this way and that way—in a word used literally, to be 'distracted'. If the news over the radio or by post is to his liking he exults, but if 'The Admiralty regret to announce . . .' comes too often he is plunged into gloom. Christian he may be by profession and desire, but until the life within is garrisoned by a power that sets no store by rumour, or the conflicting fortunes of the changing day, he will remain a victim of worry, and God's purpose in his life is impaired, if not thwarted altogether. What has Paul to say to such a man? First, he must cease to be distracted, and in this the victim has himself a part to play. 'In nothing be anxious; but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God', that is, instead of being pulled this way and that way, he turns resolutely and unreservedly in one direction—towards God. He does not do this with an empty mind—three different words for prayer follow, and not one of them can be omitted, nor can the spirit in which all prayer is to be offered be overlooked. To begin with, we have the general word which embraces all communion with God; then follows 'supplication', which is prayer for aid in which the whole community can join, whereas the next word 'requests' refers to prayers which are personal to the suppliant. To state it differently, a man who heeds Paul's advice turns resolutely away from the brooding apprehensions which have vexed him,

towards God, reminding himself as he does so of God's nature and His promises. He worships before he supplicates, in order that his thought of God may be more intense and ardent than his consciousness of the fears that have troubled him. Thus his perspective is corrected, and he is able now with confidence to join with all God's people in asking that the Heavenly Father may remember His needy children everywhere, granting them those things which are requisite and necessary; that He may put down the mighty from their seats; that He may establish His Kingdom upon earth. In such prayer he is one of a vast company, of which his own associates and fellow-church members form the nearest and best-known part, but there are petitions which are personal to himself; for his own loved ones, for his own special needs which have been the immediate causes of his 'worry'—these are his 'requests'. One all-important factor still remains to be stressed, for, according to Paul, the whole of a Christian's prayer-life; prayer, supplication, and request alike—is to be suffused with the spirit of thanksgiving, an element too often overlooked, for Elizabeth Barrett Browning is right, 'Lips say, "God be pitiful", Who ne'er said "God be praised".' It is an excellent rule, in the devotional life, to accompany every supplication with an act of recollection, in which a man deliberately evokes from the past a record of God's mercies to himself. In these days of war, when quite naturally and rightly our 'supplications' ascend for our country's cause and for the triumph of liberty everywhere, and our 'requests' are offered for our own dear ones near and far, do we remember, as we ought, to thank God for our English speech and birth, and for the years of unclouded happiness that we have spent with the relatives now in jeopardy?

If our prayer-life is thus ordered, we need have no doubt about the issue, says Paul. Over our everyday existence 'the peace of God' mounts guard. In Philippi, a Roman colony, that figure of speech needed no interpretation, nor should it in the England of 1940. It is a peace which 'passes understanding', not because it contradicts reason but because it transcends

48 THE PEACE OF GOD: A PAULINE STUDY

it, belonging to a realm whose certitudes do not depend on logic, for 'the heart has its own reasons, which the reason does not know'. The all-important thing to remember is that God's peace cannot garrison a life that listens to those Fifth Column traitors whose names are Gloom and Worry, but where these are banished, the great thing happens, 'And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, *shall* guard your hearts and your thoughts in Christ Jesus'.

WILFRID L. HANNAM

THE THREE R's OF METHODISM

THE simplest and truest thing to say of the eighteenth century is that it was the backwash of the seventeenth. The seventeenth century was the heroic age of modern England, the age of titanic struggles. Parliament wrestled with the Crown, Cromwell with Charles, the Puritans with Laud, Pym with Strafford. It was the age of Vane and Milton, of Baxter and Bunyan, of Clarendon and Montrose. Giants fought out great issues without giving or asking quarter. Who could exaggerate the strength of passion that sent to the block in swift succession, Strafford (our potential Richelieu), the Archbishop of Canterbury, and finally the king himself? Prolonged civil war—that worst of evils—tore the country in pieces. Families were divided, Churches split, the State rent in twain. Swift revolutions of fortune exasperated these partisan feuds. Extremist goaded extremist to bloody reprisal. Puritans and Cavaliers in turn fled the mother country to seek refuge in America or on the Continent. With the Restoration, Royalist and Anglican vengeance fell upon Roundheads and Regicides. The clergy, formerly expelled by the Cromwellians, returned to their parishes. The best of the Puritan preachers, including John Wesley's grandfather, were thrown out of their livings, many of them into poverty or prison.

After the storm there followed a long ground-swell. A country Protestant by law, and still haunted by memories of Smithfield, the Armada and the Gunpowder Plot, was ruled by two Romanist kings. With amazing dexterity Charles II maintained his position. His brother, James II, a bigoted reactionary in Church and State, was challenged by Monmouth's Rebellion, and finally escaped the ignominy of dethronement by flight. Despairing of the Stuarts, English statesmen invited Dutch William to ascend the throne. Even

then our troubles were not over. A disputed succession, venomous party strife, followed by Marlborough's campaigns, shook the country. After enduring such a strain, it is no wonder the people were weary. All they asked was to rest and lick their wounds. To a tired and disillusioned England Walpole seemed the ideal Prime Minister. His coarseness and cynicism, even his blatant political corruption, weighed little against the fact that he gave the nation a long period of peace. His motto, *quieta non movere*, 'let sleeping dogs lie', sounded almost a gospel to men deafened by the din of revolution and civil war. For wellnigh a quarter of a century this shrewd, gross, imperturbable Norfolk squire governed Hanoverian England. Ideals, principles, enthusiasms, crusades—the country had had its fill! Under Walpole there would be no more heroics.

In the religious sphere the same negative policy prevailed. The Church took its cue from the State. Its obsequious bishops and deans swallowed the German kings and their frightful mistresses. Fifty years of Whig rule, cold and Epicurean, imposed on the English Church the spirit of laxity. The most learned and saintly of the clergy were non-jurors who remained faithful to the House of Stuart. The Archbishop of Canterbury (Sancroft) and five of his brethren (including Ken) were deprived of their sees and were followed into exile by more than four hundred of their humbler brethren. Remembering with disgust the excesses of popular religious zeal in the preceding century, churchmen looked askance at enthusiasm. In spite of notable exceptions, the higher clergy as a whole were too closely identified with the Court, and the lower with the Squires. Jane Austen has sketched the type. They were good fellows in society and in sport, but did not pretend to be spiritual leaders. Many Anglican parsons came from well-to-do families. Rents and the price of land were rising, and country squires found it convenient to put younger sons into the family living. Parsonages were enlarged into lesser manor houses. These swollen rectories with their gardens and

grounds have survived to our own day, to be an incubus to their embarrassed occupants.

Of course, all this had its good hearty side, and the defects of the clergy have been exaggerated by partisans anxious to stress the merit of Wesley. Yet even Anglican historians confess the lack of zeal, the suspicion of devotion, and the neglect of the poor. There were many good scholars and good men in the Church, but audiences as illiterate as were nineteen out of twenty Englishmen, were not likely to be impressed by the academic arguments of Bishop Butler or the decent moderation of ethical homilies.

Churchmen were on the defensive. They spoke not as men having authority, but as the Scribes. They could make out a sound case for Christianity as a theory, but a living experience of religion as a radiant and transforming power was rare indeed. No one will suspect Gladstone of depreciating the Church he so dearly loved; he says: 'The preaching of the Gospel had disappeared, not by denial but by lapse, from the majority of Anglican pulpits.'

Aridity afflicted Dissent as well as the Establishment. The stronger churches were respectable and unenterprising. The once zealous Presbyterians had declined into Unitarians. The Independents were dispirited and impotent. The Quakers, once popular revivalists, had begun to master their secret of combining spiritual detachment with commercial prosperity. A Christianity so diluted that prayer became useless, the Bible unreal, revelation impossible, and redemption unnecessary—to such bathos had Anglo-Catholic devotion and Evangelical fervour sunk. No trumpet sounded 'from the hid battlements of Eternity'. The salt had lost its savour.

Two supreme satirists, Swift and Hogarth, have given us a portrait of the times. No doubt a satirist is a one-sided witness; but when all allowance is made, their exposure of the corruption and brutality in every stratum of English society, remains unchallenged.

Frederick the Great, speaking of England's distress in the

eighteenth century, said: 'England was long in labour, but at last brought forth a man.' Frederick is referring to the Great Commoner. But Lecky puts Wesley nearer the vital centre than even Pitt. 'There was a man sent from God whose name was John.'

In the Wesley (Wellesley) coat of arms are escallops, a reminder that one of his ancestors had gone as pilgrim or crusader to the Holy Land. It was in the veritable spirit of a pilgrim in search of the grail of spiritual truth, and of a crusader sworn to the defence of the Cross, that John Wesley spent his life.

His achievement may be summed up by saying that he drove formality, dullness, and slackness from English religion and brought in their place Reality, Rapture, and Rule. These are the three R's of Methodism.

I. *Reality*. Thomas Chalmers called Methodism 'Christianity in earnest'. In the eleventh year of the movement, Wesley drew up a short list of questions as guide-posts to truth; among them: 'What is real, genuine Christianity?' The long pilgrimage that led, 'o'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent', to Aldersgate Street, is the measure of his refusal to be satisfied with substitutes. Nothing less than Reality could suffice. 'I love Calvin a little, Luther more, the Moravians Mr. Law and Mr. Whitefield far more than either. But I love truth more than all.' No man ever sought truth more honestly or more doggedly. In the end the seeker became the finder. From the outer courts of the Temple he penetrated to the Holy of Holies. There in the light of the Shekinah he found the Saviour and came to himself.

The conventional Christianity of his day was described by Wesley in a flash of genius, as *Painted Fire*. It was a sham; worse than none at all. Immersion in professional ambition, ecclesiastical organization, theological discussion, gave an illusion of reality, but could give nothing more. *Painted Fire*. So far from overcoming the world, it was hardly resisting it. Wesley was not content to be a professional Christian; he was

a man of God. He brought religion from the outward to the inward, from arguing about God to knowing Him, from convention to conviction, from what William James called 'the chill periphery', to the radiant core. The futility of moonlight was superseded by energizing sunlight. So possessed was he by the reality of the Gospel that he felt conscious of boundless power. He records after a series of services in Bristol and the West Country: 'I felt I could shake the universe.' He was 'alive unto God', the living God. God was something more than the probable conclusion of an argument. He was the *ens realissimum*, the Reality of Realities. Not even Newman's certainty of God was more absolute and luminous than Wesley's.

Convinced that the religion of his day was actually an inoculation against genuine Christianity, Wesley boldly wished its critics success. 'Go on and prosper', he cried, 'shame these nominal Christians out of that poor superstition which they call Christianity. Reason, rally, laugh them out of their thin dead empty forms, void of spirit, of faith and of love.' Voltaire never said things more scathing about pseudo-Christianity.

Wesley's last sermons to the University of Oxford bring to mind Keble's sermon on 'National Apostasy,' a century later. They are full of phrases calculated to stab the spirit broad awake. 'Saints of the world', 'baptized heathen', whose religion is only 'a poor superstition or mean pageantry'—no wonder his words seemed to the authorities 'full of presumption and of seeming imprecation'. Sermons such as that on 'The Almost Christian' challenged his hearers to pass from half-belief to belief, from 'knowledge about' to 'acquaintance with'. Wesley's amazingly vivid realization of the Christian Faith is well illustrated in his teaching on the Holy Spirit. He urged that the direct action of God upon the spirit of man was not confined to a remote and pedestalled past. It was a fact, *the* fact of the present. The time had come for another chapter of the Acts of the Apostles to be written.

Wesley, then, was remorseless in his quest for reality. To his

followers he submitted four test questions—'Have I the forgiveness of my sins? Have I victory over sin, both inward and outward? Have I a sense of the Power of God in my life? Have I found something which I feel a burning eagerness to pass on to others?'

To men thus seeking first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, the promises of God proved to be Yea and Amen. The divine parables of the Gospel were found to be the simple truth. Methodist believers lived them over again. Their experience of Reconciliation was indeed the finding of the Pearl of Great Price; it was coming Home from the far country. The dramatic metaphors of St. Paul (the Methodists were great students of the Apostle) were demonstrated to be sober fact—servitude to sonship, bondage to liberty, darkness to light, death to life. The essential features of St. Paul's inner life were reproduced in countless eighteenth-century converts—power over sin, joy independent of material possessions, peace deeper than circumstances, love stronger than selfish and competitive instincts, courage intact in face of the world and death. Surely these things are a clue to Reality. If such tests are not valid, if such mastery of life is rooted in illusion, where are we to look for the truth?

II. *Rapture*. M. Bergson in his Huxley Lecture declared that: 'Joy always announces that life has succeeded, gained ground, conquered. All great joy has a triumphant note.' No one can read the Methodist Hymns and fail to detect this 'triumphant note'. Those hymns were no poetical exercises concocted in the study. With their blended tragedy and triumph, they were the spontaneous, irresistible outpourings of full hearts.

'I felt my heart strangely warmed', was John Wesley's characteristically restrained way of describing his life's crucial and creative hour. From that hour, the note of wonder, native to the New Testament, returned to English Christianity. Wesley had always been fastidiously reverent. We may say that the note of Anglicanism is reverence. But the note of Methodism is Rapture. Rapture is more positive and

sublime than reverence; it includes and transcends it. Such words as:

Where shall my wondering soul begin?

or

I woke, the dungeon flamed with light,
My chains fell off and I was free,

are the utterance not of reverence, but of that astonishing and ineffable joy for which the only name is Rapture. Dr. Doddridge wrote:

Ye humble souls that seek the Lord
Chase all your fears away,
And bow with *pleasure* down to see
The place where Jesus lay.

Pleasure! How paltry a word for the triumphant joy of Easter morning! Wesley substituted *rapture*, and lifted the whole stanza to a loftier plane. Indeed, *rapture* was a favourite word with the Wesleys. We meet with it frequently, e.g. in that inspired outburst:

The dear tokens of His passion
Still His dazzling body bears,
Cause of endless exultation
To His ransomed worshippers;
With what *rapture* (sung thrice)
Gaze we on those glorious scars.

This note of overwhelming joy was not the exclusive possession of an élite. The early Methodist biographies reveal how tradesmen, soldiers, mechanics, labourers—average English folk—entered into this glorious inheritance.

An analysis of rapture discloses two components—intense joy and astonishment, a joy 'too good to be true'. We may say that Wesley's kinsman, the Iron Duke, realized rapture in that supreme moment when on the night of Waterloo he lifted his cocked hat in the air and shouted: 'The whole line will advance.' How awful had been the tension, how nearly had the foe prevailed, how amazing had been the endurance of his red-coats during that long day. The issue had hung for hours by a hair. And now there rang out the cry which no

field had heard before, *La Garde recule!* Napoleon's last stroke had failed. Victory was won! Upon the battle-scarred face of Wellington there gleamed for a moment the light of rapture. Rapture is victory snatched from disaster, peace out of pain, the rainbow glory after the storm, Easter after Calvary. Here is the reason why the early Methodists brought rapture back into currency. They had known reconciliation after estrangement, had passed out of darkness into marvellous light. The Lord had 'turned again the captivity of Zion', and the erstwhile exiles were 'like them that dream'. They sang:

In wonder lost, with trembling joy
We take the pardon of our God.

Some lines in *The Winter's Tale* might have been written by Shakespeare as a motto for the Methodists:

They looked as if they heard of a world ransomed or one destroyed;
A notable passion of wonder appeared in them.

Methodist hymns are incomparably the most thrilling ever written precisely because they enshrine this wellnigh incredible experience of redemption. No emotion could be too intense to do justice to this amazing spiritual emancipation. There was nothing forced or faked about it. It was 'the joy of the Lord', the purest, deepest joy of which the soul of man was capable. Therefore, in spite of their well-bred restraint, the Wesleys were not afraid of rapture. They had felt it themselves and expected others to feel it.

III. The third touchstone of authentic Methodism is *Rule*. After the transports of rapture, *Rule* seems an anti-climax, a disconcerting descent from the sublime to the humdrum. Yet rule was as characteristic of Methodism as rapture. It was the very secret of John Wesley to unite seeming incompatibles. The sanest of religious leaders, his wisdom was as comprehensive and balanced as it was ardent. This is why he has been misunderstood by friends and foes alike. His all-round symmetry has always baffled and annoyed one-sided partisans. Small men accuse the great of inconsistency, unable to see that

to be many-sided is not to be inconsistent. No one ever realized more clearly than Wesley that truth is too great, and human nature and society too complicated, to admit simple solutions. He therefore insisted on wedding rule to rapture. In so doing he redeemed both. Rapture was safeguarded and rule inspired. Rule without rapture is dead; rapture without rule is transitory. 'Feeling', as Plato said, 'in its pure form is a pathway to the knowledge of God.' As a matter of fact John Wesley's feelings were not as rapturous as he would have liked them to be. If he ever envied any man anything, it probably was his brother Charles's emotional intensity.

Nevertheless, emotion though desirable, nay essential, was not enough. With the example of Rousseau before him, Wesley was determined that among his disciples emotion should never be a substitute for conduct.

Wesley's aristocratic temper not only enabled him to despise the clamour of mobs; it forbade him to exploit emotion as an end in itself. He was the herald not of a new thrill, but of a new life: Christianity delivered not only from the guilt but from the power of sin.

It is a cardinal point of faith in a romantic age, or in popular movements, that there is something admirable in violent emotion for its own sake. Wesley recoiled from undisciplined feeling. The steam generated in the boiler is destructive unless it is harnessed to some work. Disciplined emotion spells power. He who combined Anglican and Dissenting strains in his blood, and throughout life strove to combine into a richer whole elements that seemed discordant, insisted that Devotion should be linked to Duty. His people were to be governed not by mood but by method.

It is obvious that the Methodist type of religion had its perils. No one recognized more clearly than Wesley the danger of religion becoming an emotional indulgence, an escape from life rather than an equipment for it. A religion that placed so frank an emphasis on individualistic, subjective, emotional elements was in danger of breeding cranks and charlatans—the

sort of people who glory in their abnormality and treat it as a sign of merit. A slight acquaintance with the excesses into which the romantic impulse drove men will reveal the wholeness of Wesley's system of discipline. Critics have condemned what they call Wesley's inquisitorial zeal, but at least it purged his societies of religion without virtue, godliness without goodness, emotion without character, words without deeds. A religious experience packed with dramatic episodes, penitence, faith, forgiveness, acceptance, assurance, perfection—what pitfalls of presumption and perversity strew the road! Keenly aware of the dangers, through his own experience, knowledge of Church history and observation of men about him, Wesley corrected the tendencies towards feeling, freedom, diversity by the tendencies towards reason and order. He coined the epigram—'A good Methodist will be as inward as a Quaker and as outward as a Pharisee'! To protect his people against sentimentalism and flamboyance, he brought into play the Bible, Reason, the yoke of Rule, the observation of Days and Discipline, and the use of a Liturgy. Band and Class Meetings and other compulsory means of grace were the compensating balance of personal idiosyncrasy. Law was the friend of liberty.

In his admirable *Political Theories of the English Romanticists* Crane Brinton observes: 'The Methodists were a striking instance of the imposition of rational bounds on essentially rebellious, centrifugal, anarchic emotions.'

Wesley was the last man to tolerate the doctrine that one is to do good only when feeling free to do it. He once said: 'My mother did not feel for others nearly so much as my father, but she did ten times more.' He admonishes a correspondent: 'Labour to do the will of God and leave Him to supply the feelings.'

The key to Wesley's character lies in his words about Aldersgate Street: 'Being exceedingly heavy of heart, I went *very unwillingly*¹ to a meeting of the Religious Society.'

¹ My italics.

It is curious that the vital words should be generally overlooked. But for this characteristic victory over the tyranny of mood, there would have been no Aldersgate Street. His strange warming of heart was not the contradiction but the consummation of fifteen strenuous faithful years. Influenced by Jeremy Taylor and William Law, Wesley emphasized the necessity of spiritual technique. 'What arts of holy living have you?' was a question put to his preachers. God would give nothing to the casual.

The Methodists were to be to the Anglican Church what the Jesuits were to the Roman—a *corps d'élite*, equipped for special service by a higher discipline.

People grumbled when Wesley expelled defaulters, but at least they respected a Society which had its rules, and insisted on its members keeping them. One can imagine what Wesley would have said to a Methodist who excused his absence from the ordinary means of grace by pleading that he came 'when there was anything special'!

Systematic exercise unto godliness is not destructive of genuine rapture, but its preservative. To present-day defeatists who justify their inaction by the plea—'What we need is a Revival', Wesley would answer: 'Unfaltering loyalty to our Church duties is the best preparation for, and the surest pledge of true revival.' God will not leave such devotion unrewarded. One must go to the means of grace, even if 'very unwillingly'. If one cannot 'mount up with wings as eagles', one must 'walk and not faint'. From first to last Duty remained sacred.

John Wesley was commonly supposed to be the champion and exemplar of 'enthusiasm'. Yet in the *Large Minutes* of 1770 he wrote:

Q. Why are we not more holy?

A. Because we are enthusiasts.

Q. What are enthusiasts?

A. Men who look for the end without using the means.

If men honour impulse above discipline, or imagine that

the supreme good is identical with the supreme thrill, they have turned their back upon Wesley.

Given reality, religion must be a river guided and canalized by banks, not a wasteful disorderly flood. The Romantic impulse expresses itself in Love and Liberty: the Classic impulse in Loyalty and Law. Wesley harmonized them, and proved them to be complementary rather than antagonistic. Here lay his originality. A Methodism that maintains its hold on the three R's, *Reality, Rapture, Rule*, is true to its Founder, and has a unique contribution to make to the Catholic Church.

F. BROMPTON HARVEY

FREDERIC W. MACDONALD

IT is, I believe, close upon a hundred years since Frederic Macdonald was born, and more than a dozen since he died, and there is some danger that he may be passing slowly into oblivion. I should like to do something to delay this inevitable process; for alike in his character and in his remarkable talents he deserves to live, especially in the memory of the Methodist body which he served so long and well. In his autobiography, *As a tale that is told*, he has, indeed, said something about his own life; but his characteristic modesty has left out much that his friends might like to hear.

He belonged, of course, to an older generation than mine, but none of my coevals could have shown himself more sympathetic, or seemed less conscious of the superiority which age and experience gave him. He treated me always as if I had been an equal or a fellow-student; he talked, but he also listened; and, though sometimes he must often have been hearing what he had known for years, there was never a sign of impatience. He was a true Christian; but he had the best qualities of a man of the world.

I first heard him preach in very early youth. That sermon is still clear in my memory: I recall the text, 'He must increase and I must decrease'; and I recall also the perfection of his delivery, and the neatness of his arrangement of his themes, which, young as I was, struck me as unsurpassable. The audience, which was large, listened spellbound; for his words, though well-chosen, were always simple. Nothing was more abhorrent to him than pedantry; and yet, to those who had eyes to see, there was, underlying it all, the mark of the truest culture.

The next time I heard him was when I was at the University, and then I had the privilege of meeting him and enjoying a walk with him. He had, he said, not been at a University him-

self: his father had only just been able to send his elder brother to Oxford, and even a scholarship would not have enabled him to meet a second expense of the kind. But I rather think that this was an advantage rather than a misfortune; he had learnt French at a school in the Channel Islands, and I afterwards discovered (not from him) that he had been an early student at Owens College, Manchester, where the teaching was fully up to Oxford standards. Besides, he had no ambition to be a specialized scholar. He could read and appreciate the Classics: he loved his Horace and Virgil, and that was enough. He preferred breadth to depth. Not that, in his case, breadth meant superficiality.

A more charming 'table-talker' could hardly be found. His wide travels gave him many opportunities of interesting his auditors, who, of course, were only too willing to allow him room to fill in details and make his descriptions clear and lively. Thus I heard him give an account of the wonderful scenes at the burial of the great writer Manzoni, an account so vivid that we could all but see the crowds with our bodily eyes. Similarly with his anecdotes of his early days, or of his nephew Rudyard Kipling's first attempts at story-telling. Many of his anecdotes showed his power of mimicry—a power, however, always kept under strict control.

All these gifts made him, as older people will remember, a public lecturer of special force and one who enjoyed great popularity wherever he went. I often heard him speaking on literary topics, and always with enjoyment; and here I may recall how, on one occasion, he went with me to an academic lecture on an English poet, delivered by a University professor to a learned audience. Afterwards he talked of this lecture. 'What interested me in it', he said, 'was the difference between what the professor said and what I should have to say on the same theme. Much that he omitted I should have to include, and much that he said I should leave out. Also, our ways of putting things must be different; even his touches of humour are not of the kind my people would appreciate; and where he

worked by allusion or by studied reticence I must be plain and above-board.'

But I think I liked him best in his impromptu speeches, which indeed other speakers might have envied for their finish. Once, when Hugh Price Hughes had been addressing a small society, and Macdonald was called on to follow him, he produced an extempore speech, with beginning, middle, and end, which might have been prepared during weeks. At the end, he apologized, most unnecessarily, for its length. 'You must throw the blame', he said, 'on the contagious fluency of Mr. Hughes.' Another example I have mentioned elsewhere, but it may bear repeating. At a prize-giving Sir Frederick Treves, the famous surgeon, was the chief speaker, and he had been telling the boys that they ought to specialize from very early days. At fourteen, for instance, they might choose science. At fifteen they should select a particular branch of science, at sixteen a branch of that branch, and so on, until perhaps they might be authorities on some minute fraction of the vast field. Everything in this theory, I knew, was directly opposed to what F. W. Macdonald held dear; and what was my surprise when I saw a paper passed to him which implied that he was to move the vote of thanks. But I need not have been anxious. He was equal to the occasion, and contrived to mingle dissidence with urbanity in characteristic fashion. 'There were', he said, 'a few things in Sir Frederick Treves's speech with which I should not like to express complete agreement without more time than is at my disposal.'

In his latest years I never saw him, and for a sad reason. He was confined to his bed, with no hope of leaving it. By some miraculous means, however, he contrived to write, though lying flat on his back, and every word was clearly legible. Every now and then he would send me a book, either one he had himself written, or one with which he had special associations. Thus he would write: 'I can no longer read small print; please accept this little copy of the Odyssey.' But the one I value most is a tiny Horace, which, at the age of eighty-four,

he sent me 'In Remembrance'. This he had carried with him on his Italian tours, and pencil-marks showed not only his favourite passages, but the places he had visited which the poet had also known. Of all writers I think Horace was the one with whom he most keenly sympathized: the moderation, contentment, and humorous serenity of the old Roman were exactly what he appreciated to the full. As St. Paul is said to have found something of himself in Virgil, so Fred Macdonald found a kindred spirit in Horace—with Christianity alone missing.

A Christian indeed he was; and it was this which enabled him to bear his terrible deprivations—among which the loss of his social contacts was not the least—not only with fortitude but with cheerfulness. Here is a portion of the last letter I ever received from him:

'I am now in my eighty-sixth year, and the seventh of my confinement to bed, and I am dependent upon nurses by day and by night. My hands are crippled, and I hold a pen with difficulty. But, thank God, my mind continues clear; I can read and think, and when a friend comes my way I can converse with him freely. And what I am still more thankful for is that I am not groping about for some One or some Thing in whom or in which I may believe. My belief is in the main that of my childhood, and, though I have since then read some philosophy and a good deal of theology I am not ashamed to say that I still hold by the faith I learnt in early years.'

E. E. KELLETT

ENGLISH MONASTICISM

I

AN authority on monasticism, Dom David Knowles, has recently published what bids fair to become the standard work in English on the above subject in the early Middle Ages.¹ He has written an authoritative account, based on contemporary evidence, of the history of monastic institutions in this period, and of the life lived inside them; and to all who have been stimulated to read about such institutions, it may have been by the remains of their buildings in romantic places, this able study will be sure to prove both informing and fascinating.

In the first place we are confronted by the fundamental document of Western monasticism, the Rule of St. Benedict, in accordance with which the Benedictine movement was regulated. Benedict (A.D. 480-543), who hailed from Nursia, a few miles north of Rome, drew up his Rule particularly for his own monastery near Naples; but it was to become the foundation of Western monastic life in the midst of a chaotic age. For the individual monk 'no other writings, save the psalms and the gospels, had a position in any way comparable to it'. Without undue austerity, it led on from the higher aspirations of a man's nature to distinctively spiritual attitudes; it was human as well as religious. Prayer, manual labour, sleep, and recreation—all had set times of observance, while sundry ministrations outside each house, though not strongly emphasized, were by no means forgotten. Gregory the Great's monastery in Rome came to be based on the Rule, and from his pontificate it was yet more firmly the guiding principle for all monastic legislation. It would be a mistake, however, to regard the Rule as deliberately encouraging the monks to undertake service to the communities outside their houses.

¹ *The Monastic Order in England: A History of its Development from the Times of Saint Dunstan to the Fourth Lateran Council, 943-1216*, by Dom David Knowles. Cambridge University Press, 45s.

Benedict himself 'was concerned solely with the monastic life as a spiritual discipline for the service of God, and not at all with works, however necessary, of religion and charity undertaken for the world outside the walls of the monastery'.¹ But changes took place with the years, and, while the monks themselves laboured less at agriculture, they devoted more attention to the uplift of the people around; so that, by the time the middle age of the West had fully arrived, the monastic movement had indeed become part and parcel of society. Here in Britain, to which the Rule was brought by Wilfrid and Biscop, the monasteries seem to have developed into centres of all kinds of labour more conspicuously than ever they did on the Continent. Moreover, the missionary zeal of the Benedictines in the eighth century was due in great measure to the English brethren, led by the Devonshire monk Boniface. For thirty-five years he carried on his missionary apostolate in the centre of Europe, reorganizing the Frankish Church and bringing it into willing subjection to the Pope.² The ninth century proved disastrous for monasteries in this country, for 'Anglo-Saxon monasticism had ceased to live by the time of Alfred'.³ But the old traditions remained, reinforced by Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, and now the whole Benedictine Order was revived through the leadership of a second Benedict, Benedict of Aniane (750-821). He added to the Rule, which thenceforth became binding on all monks in the Empire. Missionary activity was undertaken afresh, and the ninth century is remarkable for the labours of monks in Sweden and Denmark, also for the beginning of missionary expeditions to Eastern Europe. Another dawning for Western monasticism took place when William, Duke of Aquitaine, founded a monastery at Cluny in Burgundy in the year 910. This was placed under the protection of the Pope, and quickly became the centre of a new

¹ Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England*, p. 20.

² H. M. Gwatkin, *Church and State in England to the Death of Queen Anne*, p. 8: 'The conversion of the English led straight to the conversion of Germany, and that again to the restoration of the Empire and the rise of the mediaeval Papacy.'

³ Knowles, *ibid.*, p. 24.

awakening. But the same tradition was carried forward. The enlargement of the Rule by the second Benedict was adopted by the Cluniac Revival, also by the Dunstan Revival in England.

II

Dunstan was the greatest churchman in England in the tenth century. As statesman, scholar, and saint he had no equal among his contemporaries, and Dom Knowles lingers admiringly in describing the career of this able and lovable man. He was educated at Glastonbury, of which, in 943, he became abbot. To this famous monastery, whose buildings he enlarged, he gave the Benedictine Rule; and, after a period of exile, he became Archbishop of Canterbury in 959. Supported by King Edgar, Dunstan furthered the spread of monasticism on the basis, as Dom Knowles tells us, of Anglo-Saxon tradition linked with a revised form of the second Benedict's regulations known as the *Regularis Concordia*. This revived English monasticism was less sequestered than its predecessor, was markedly national in outlook, and was closely related to the English hierarchy; hence its increased influence within the Church. Monastic foundations were a natural expression of it, such as those at Peterborough and Croyland (Crowland), and probably that at Buckfast, whose modern and imposing successor many holiday-makers journey far to see. When Dunstan died in 988 he had played a noble part as a unifier of England, and a rebuilder of its Church after troublous days. The monasteries grew in influence with the turn of the century, their interest in art and music increased, and their missionary work was renewed. Cnut sympathized with their movement, and Edward the Confessor proved his own interest by his foundation of the royal abbey of Westminster. Some slackness existed in certain of the English monasteries previous to Lanfranc's reforms. On the other hand, English monastic life still produced notable leaders, pre-eminently Wulfstan, prior of the monastery of Worcester, and later bishop, 'the last, and

certainly one of the greatest, of the bishops of pure English blood and culture'.¹ For long his shrine remained in Worcester Cathedral as an object of veneration and a place of pilgrimage, with the tomb of King John in close proximity. But the competition between these two unlike characters was too keen, and the royal tomb alone survived!

By 1066, so Dom Knowles has stated, there were thirty-five monasteries in England, mainly in the midlands and the south-west, all representing a brotherhood which was distinctly national in feeling. Into this situation there now came Norman monasticism, itself but lately revived, with its moral and intellectual gifts and grander architecture. By means of this in particular Lanfranc achieved his reforms within the Church at large. Student of law at Pavia, prior of the famous monastery of Bec, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1070, Lanfranc exactly filled the needed role of reorganizer of the English Church, while 'as the propagator of the monastic order in England and of its conversion to the Norman model he holds a place among the archbishops which only Dunstan can challenge'.² Monasticism here became more closely bound up with the hierarchy, the number of cathedral monasteries increased, monastic buildings were erected on the more imposing Norman pattern, and more contact was made with the world outside them. Cluny had not yet expended all its force as a centre of renewal. But this was true in 1100; it was hardly true one hundred years later. Abbots became more and more prelatical, aloof, men of business; and communities were prone to have recourse to litigation in defence of their privileges—rather than place first their spiritual opportunities. Such was possible because the 'black' monasteries were self-ruling, each a law to itself, and the law was slack. But Innocent III tightened up discipline through the action of the Fourth Lateran Council, 1215, by which these monasteries were organized into one whole and regularly visited by officials appointed by a triennial chapter.

¹ Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England*, p. 161.

² *ibid.*, p. 143.

III

With the Cistercians came new ideals of austerity and of manual labour. Dom Knowles speaks of how, in 1098, twenty-one earnest monks seceded from a monastery in northern Burgundy to Citeaux (the modern Corcelles, ten miles south of Dijon), where they adopted the white habit and lived in simplicity and seclusion. Their abbot, the Englishman, Stephen Harding, as the years passed, ruled them too strictly even for their liking, till, in 1112, Bernard arrived with thirty companions and brought fresh vitality to the community. Three years later Bernard was appointed head of a new foundation at Clairvaux, about sixty miles north of Dijon, in the valley of the Aube; and from a humble beginning in that solitary place Europe soon received light and warmth.

At the foundation of the great Cistercian Order there were the ideals and the legislation both of the original Benedict and of Harding. The Rule was the standard, shorn of all luxurious accretions. The more modest requirements of the communities were mainly met by the agricultural labour of lay brothers, while more time was provided for private prayer and study. The life of the various houses was kept spiritually vigorous by regular visitation, the whole Order was ruled by General Chapter, the annual gathering of all the abbots at Citeaux. As Dom Knowles observes, the white monks in their stricter way of living were an increasing challenge to the black, though it should be said that Cistercian strictness was deliberately encouraged by the policy of erecting monasteries in remote country districts. So the rural areas of Yorkshire came to be chosen for Cistercian houses, and that on account of the presence of Yorkshiremen at Clairvaux. In Skeldale were settled, in 1132, some earnest seceders from the comfortable abbey of St. Mary at York, whose monastery of 'Fountains' was admitted by Bernard's sanction into the Cistercian Order. Fountains was the mother of other communities, among them one which went on its pilgrimage in 1147 to settle ultimately at Kirkstall, now within the Leeds city boundary. In 1132 again, Rievaulx

was founded from Clairvaux in the valley of the Rye, near Helmsley, a lovely spot known to a multitude of modern travellers: 'everywhere peace, everywhere serenity, and a marvellous freedom from the tumult of the world'.¹ Aelred, its most famous abbot, who thus described it, once visited it and felt its attraction so deeply that he could not break away. His passion for Christ and the influence of his life and writings drew many novices to his monastery, and we read that in 1165, two years before his death, the Rievaulx community numbered as many as 650. Let those to-day who can turn aside to view the remains of its ancient beauty take the opportunity without reserve; they will bless the care and imagination lavished on them by His Majesty's Office of Works, into whose hands they were fortunately placed in 1918. Near by is Byland, whither came some monks from Furness in 1143, after an uncertain career of five years. Away down in the valley of the Wye Tintern was founded, direct from France, in 1131. Here, again, something of the Cistercian ideal of peaceful remoteness is portrayed by Wordsworth in his 'Lines composed a few miles above Tintern Abbey', where he fondly turns to that nature which supplies 'the still, sad music of humanity', and is

The anchor of my purest thoughts, the nurse,
The guide, the guardian of my heart, and soul
Of all my moral being.

True, the very example of Bernard's tremendous activities qualified this aim of solitude, in that 'for a brief space in the twelfth century . . . the family of Clairvaux filled the role which the Society of Jesus vindicated for itself in the Counter-Reformation'.² The brief space was an exception which proved the rule.

In course of time, by about the year 1200, the Cistercians, as well as the black monks, had increased in material possessions, and had to meet the charge of avarice, perhaps not without cause. King Richard I is reported to have made this charge against them, which might have afforded King John with an

¹ Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England*, pp. 220f.

² *ibid.*, p. 253.

added excuse for his exactions. Manifestly the Cistercians were losing something of their first love in the love of self, while the masses of the people outside the monasteries were left by them to their poverty and spiritual despair. It was not long before the Mendicant Orders were to make their appearance in the midst of those masses and bring them the Gospel meant for ordinary folk who felt their need of it. There was at least an intervening stage, for, so Dom Knowles records, the regular canons, who lived in the more populous areas in communities of their own, were maintaining contact with the people, and were 'the conduit through which a part of the monastic ideal passed on its way of evolution into the partly monastic, partly apostolic, and partly intellectual life of the Friar Preachers'.¹

IV

The second part of Dom Knowles's work provides the reader with an instructive survey of the institutional life of the monasteries. We are given a description of their elaborate organization, of their financial arrangements, of the way in which they planned the hours of day and night, and of the vegetarian fare which, at any rate according to their rules, was the sustenance of hearty men! The reputation for good works which the medieval monasteries have generally held seems to be substantiated in large measure. Hospitals were founded by certain houses; some of them, too, maintained regular pensioners. Moreover, education on the part of monastic teachers was by no means confined to the boys and youths inside the monasteries, but was available to learners outside, especially in pre-Conquest England. In Normandy, Lanfranc conducted a school for such learners at Bec, and, to some extent, did Anselm after him. In England after the Conquest the task of educating the people was taken up mostly by the parish priests, though there were separate schools which certain monasteries encouraged; also there were the rising universities, both here and on the continent. The range

¹ *ibid.*, pp. 361f.

of knowledge possessed by the monks gradually widened during the hundred years following the Conquest, but by the end of that period their teaching monopoly had gone. Medical treatment in the English houses was good, according to the standards of those times, particularly in those belonging to the black monks. Dom Knowles notes the interest taken by the English monks in the popular belief in the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, the liturgical celebration of which took place in several of their houses. 'It fell to the monks of England', he writes, 'to defend' this 'as traditional and expose as consonant with the Catholic faith'.¹ How such a belief could have been 'consonant with the Catholic faith' when it was upheld neither by the Fathers nor by the Schoolmen—until Duns Scotus—is difficult to understand, especially as it lacked the authority of the medieval Papacy. Papal approval, so it would appear, began to be given to it from the later years of the fifteenth century.

On reviewing the whole period under survey we cannot but be impressed with the enormous growth of the number of English monasteries and with the considerable increase of their material wealth. As to the former, we read that 'if the total number of monks and canons be put at about 15,000 and the population of the country at three million, it will appear that the religious amounted to between 1 and 2 per cent of the adult males of England'.² As to the latter, the wealth of the monks in 1170 'perhaps amounted to a quarter or even to a third of the total wealth of the country in lands, rents, and dues'.³ On the other hand, the spiritual influence of these men showed signs of waning so early as the Conquest, and, in spite of the influence of such leaders as Lanfranc, Anselm, and Bernard, the dangers of wealth and position were increasingly perilous.

The great book which Dom David Knowles has so painstakingly completed describes a way of holiness with which he

¹ Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England*, p. 510.

² *ibid.*, p. 679 note.

³ *ibid.*, p. 680.

himself is in evident sympathy, and the very fascination of his story cannot fail to strengthen in the mind of any eager student the desire to advance more surely toward the holy life. But evangelical Protestants would think a thousand times before considering the monastic way as being in full accord with the teaching of Christ, however deeply the monastic orders have been convinced of this. These orders, so Dom Knowles observes, have invited men 'to aim at, to tend towards, not the natural perfection of a life in a human society, but the supernatural perfection of a life of abnegation of self and imitation of Christ'.¹ Supernatural perfection, deriving its resources from Divine grace, can be sought in multitudes of places in this world other than the cloister, where, in the view of some, the perfection might tend to be, at times, unnatural. Jesus loved the ordinary folk in the common round of the world, and in the common round His may be the friendship which transfigures all life.

H. WATKIN-JONES

¹ *ibid.*, p. 219.

JOHN WESLEY AND THE 'IMITATIO CHRISTI'

THE *Imitation of Christ*, the battle over whose authorship is now generally allowed to be settled in favour of Thomas à Kempis, is reputed to be the most-printed book in the world after the Bible. C. A. Wheatley, in his *The Story of the Imitatio Christi*, computes the number of editions and translations at about 3000. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, however, says that there have been over 6000!

Much emphasis has rightly been placed by Wesley's biographers on the part played by this work at an important turning-point in his career, in the year 1725. Along with Jeremy Taylor's *Holy Living* and *Holy Dying* it awakened his devotional life, and helped to form lifelong habits of prayer and meditation. This spiritual awakening Wesley described on several occasions, the best known and most illuminating record being that contained in the review of his life which he wrote immediately after the heart-warming experience of May, 1738:

When I was about twenty-two, my father pressed me to enter into holy orders. At the same time, the providence of God directing me to Kempis's *Christian Pattern*, I began to see, that true religion was seated in the heart, and that God's law extended to all our thoughts as well as words and actions. I was, however, very angry at Kempis for being too strict; though I read him only in Dean Stanhope's translation. Yet I had frequently much sensible comfort in reading him, such as I was an utter stranger to before. . . .

This epochal reading of Kempis in 1725, however, was not Wesley's first acquaintance with the book—nor was it by any means the last! Writing to his mother in May, 1725, Wesley speaks of it as a book 'which I had frequently seen, but never much looked into before'. Indeed, he must certainly have seen it at Epworth, for his mother possessed a well-used copy, and his father also was familiar with Kempis. It seems likely that Wesley's prejudices against the author as a Roman Catholic

JOHN WESLEY AND THE 'IMITATIO CHRISTI' 75

had previously erected a strong barrier against more than a nodding acquaintance with the *Imitation*. Closer study served to break down that barrier, although Wesley could never entirely forget those prejudices, linking Kempis with Gregory Lopez, the Marquis de Renty, and Francis of Sales, as men who were wonderfully enabled to live saintly lives in spite of their grievous theological mistakes. During the Georgia years Kempis was Wesley's constant companion, and the young Oxford Methodists agreed, in their 'Scheme of Self-Examination', to meditate upon the *Imitation* from 6 a.m. until 7 a.m. every Sunday. In his own devotional life Wesley continued to use Kempis, even during his waning years. Always, however, he maintained a critical attitude towards the book, as may be seen from an anecdote related by John Byrom, the author of the hymn 'Christians, Awake', who had bought two copies of Wesley's edition of Kempis on its publication in 1735, and had had them specially bound for his two nephews. Wesley visited Byrom's home at Manchester in 1761, and their conversation turned to mysticism, and Thomas à Kempis. Describing the course of this conversation (perhaps 'argument' would be a better word!), Byrom writes:

He said, that all good authors might be inspired, but there was none but who mixed their own spirit; that Thomas à Kempis was next to the Bible, but in him there was transubstantiation and purgatory, and I could not get the smallest entire book that was quite through inspired.

The edition of Kempis which Wesley first studied was that published by the well-known Dean George Stanhope, which had been issued in 1696 under the title of *The Christian's Pattern*, and which remained for many years the standard version. Stanhope was a great translator and modernizer, whose literary efforts include smoothly-phrased and expanded editions of Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, Charron, Andrewes's *Devotions*, and Robert Parson's *Christian Directory*, as well as of the *Imitation*. His translation was based on the Latin text of Castellio. It is hardly right to call it a translation, however, for it is really a paraphrase, and often a very free one. Ob-

viously anticipating this charge, Stanhope wrote in his preface: 'In order to preserve the Zeal and Spirit of the Author, it was found necessary, sometimes to abridge, and at others to enlarge a Thought, and carry it a little higher.' The resulting devotional treatise, in Stanhope's own flowing (and by no means unpleasing) style, more than made up for the undoubted loss of Kempis's simple dignity—in the opinion of many seventeenth- and eighteenth-century readers, at any rate. Indeed, Stanhope's *Christian's Pattern* continued to be issued well into the nineteenth century, and in 1886 Henry Morley edited it for Sir John Lubbock's 'Hundred Best Books'.

In spite of the blessing which his first real glimpse of Kempis had afforded him, Wesley felt that Stanhope sadly obscured Kempis. Nowhere does he openly pour scorn on Stanhope's translation, although his dissatisfaction can clearly be sensed in the phrase 'though I read him only in Dean Stanhope's translation'. Examination of Wesley's preface to his own edition of Kempis reveals, however, several other phrases which are certainly aimed at Stanhope, though not by name, such as the following:

Of all paraphrases, none is more destructive of the sense, none more contrary to the spirit, of this author, than that which attempts to polish his style, and refine his simplicity into eloquence. This has been attempted in our own tongue, but has not been universally approved.

Stanhope's preface had spoken of 'the English Version hitherto in use', which 'was in some places grown obsolete, and in many fell short of that Life and Spirit requisite for such Devotional Tracts'. This was almost certainly the version by Dr. John Worthington, itself based on previous English translations, and frequently reprinted, though often without his name, so that it has been variously attributed to Page, Stanhope, and Hickes. Wesley somehow came across this translation—probably it was a second-hand copy of the 1677 edition of Worthington's *Christian Pattern* that he purchased on July 24, 1732, for 1s. 6d. (See *Wesley Studies*, p. 181.) Obviously, in spite of being 'in some places grown obsolete', it was much

more dignified and closer to the original than Stanhope's version. Its austerity appealed to the 'Lover of Good English and Common Sense', although he felt that even this translation savoured in parts of paraphrase. Wesley's preference for the simpler version of Dr. Worthington has been confirmed by later generations, several modern editions being based on it, although the 'Everyman Edition' has gone back farther still, to the first English translation, of 1504.

Whether the idea of revising the old version for publication came to Wesley immediately and spontaneously we do not know, although the publication of the Oxford Diaries might throw some light on this, as on other problems. It is quite possible that William Law had unconsciously suggested the task to him, for it was in July of 1732 that Wesley paid his first visit to Law's Putney home, and late in the same month that the copy of Kempis was bought. Law himself refers to the prominent part played by Kempis in their first conversations, and recalls with what urgency he had recommended the *Imitation* to Wesley. At any rate, Wesley did decide, at some time between 1732 and 1735, to make this apparently anonymous *Christian's Pattern* the basis of a still closer translation. To this end he appears to have procured in addition several Latin editions of Kempis, including those published at Antwerp in 1634, and at Cologne in 1682. With these he compared Worthington's translation, and corrected it on principles which he enumerates in his preface. He divided the text up into short sentences, and maintained that his version was closer to the original, still simpler in style, and freed from all ambiguities.

It is necessary to stress, however, that Wesley's edition of Kempis was by no means an original translation, although this mistake has often been made. C. A. Wheatley, for instance, speaks of 'Wesley's translation' as being good, and fairly close to the original, whilst the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* says: 'Of English translations, the most interesting is that by John Wesley, under the title *The Christian's Pattern* (1735).' (In

spite of the error with regard to the actual authorship of the translation, this latter is a fine tribute to Wesley, in so far as his is the only English edition singled out for mention.) That such mistakes can be made seems strange in view of the definite statement made by Wesley in his preface—'Although this edition of the *Christian Pattern* be the same, as to the main of the translation, with that printed at London in the year 1677 . . .' This preface was omitted from later editions, of course, but there still remain statements such as that in a well-known letter to William Law, where he speaks of 'how qualified or unqualified I was to correct a translation of Kempis, and to translate a preface to it'. At least one early non-Methodist writer realized Wesley's indebtedness, and even knew the name of his creditor, for a correspondent in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1813 (Part 2, p. 649) speaks of his edition of Kempis in 1748 as being 'Printed with little alteration from Dr. W.' (A 1748 edition of Wesley's Kempis is not known—possibly the date is an error or a misprint.)

The revised translation which eventually resulted from Wesley's labours was one of his earliest literary ventures, and one of the most pleasing from the point of view of a bibliophile. It was published by Charles Rivington, the founder of the well-known firm of Rivington's, in 1735. It is a beautifully produced volume, with a title-page in black and red—in this latter respect almost unique amongst Wesley's publications. The title-page runs as follows (the words here printed in italics being red in the original):

The *Christian's Pattern*, or, a Treatise of the *Imitation of Christ*. Written Originally in Latin, By Thomas à Kempis. *With a Preface* Containing an Account of the Usefulness of this Treatise: Directions for Reading it with Advantage; And likewise an Account of this Edition. Compared with the Original, and corrected throughout, By *John Wesley, M.A.* Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxon. London: Printed for C. Rivington, at the Bible and Crown in St. Paul's Church-yard. *M DCC XXXV.*

The volume, an octavo of over 350 pages, contained five copper-plate engravings, one of which was reproduced to illustrate

The Publishing Family of Rivington. It appears never to have been reprinted in its entirety.

When the title *Christian's Pattern* was first applied to the *Imitation* seems a little uncertain. The early translations, such as those of Hake (1567), Rogers (1584), and Page (1639), use some form of the more usual *Imitation of Christ*. Worthington's edition, first published soon after 1650, was entitled 'The Christian's Pattern, Or A Divine Treatise of the Imitation of Christ. Written Originally in Latin, by Thomas of Kempis, above 200 Years since'. (This is from the 1677 edition, the earliest possessed by the British Museum, and the one which Wesley used.) Stanhope employed practically the same title, except that he omitted the word 'Divine', in which Wesley follows him. Robert Nelson also published an edition of Kempis with the same title in 1715. In the index to Watts's *Bibliotheca Britannica*, however, there is no mention of any *Christian's Pattern*, not even of Stanhope's much-popularized version! During the late seventeenth century, however, and all of the eighteenth, it was the standard title for Kempis's book. As far as the evidence goes, we must assume that the name was first used by Dr. John Worthington.

It is interesting to note that Wesley's dissatisfaction with Stanhope's translation eventually reacted on that very book. The writer possesses a copy of Stanhope's *Christian Pattern* which clearly shows Wesley's influence. In the first place, its format is similar to Wesley's—a well-produced octavo volume, with the title-page printed in black and red, and containing four copper-plate engravings. Moreover, its imprint runs 'Compar'd with the Original, and the Translations by the Rev. Mr. Wesley, &c. and in several Places amended. Manchester: Printed by R. Whitworth; near the Exchange. MDCCXL.' The preface to this book, a revised Stanhope published only five years after Wesley's edition, contains the following passages:

The Translation of this excellent Book by the learned and ingenious Dr. Stanhope, which has been so well received by the Publick, that

above Twenty Thousand of them have been sold, is principally followed in this Edition, tho' not without consulting those published by Mr. Wesley, and an ingenious anonymous Author; and as in this Edition more Assistance has been had than in any former one, it is hop'd it will justly claim the Preference.

The editor then gives Stanhope's original preface, and continues:

The following Directions, chiefly taken from Mr. Wesley, may be serviceable to the profitable Reading of this, or any religious Book.

These directions are an adaptation and abridgement of the shortened preface which Wesley prepared for his pocket edition of the *Christian's Pattern*. Although this revision of Stanhope is very slightly abridged and modernized, it must be confessed that Wesley's influence upon it is neither as marked nor as drastic as one could wish.

Wesley's pocket edition of Kempis has just been mentioned. This was published in the same year as the larger volume, with a greatly shortened preface, and only one engraving. It was specially designed for those who could not afford the larger and more elaborate volume. An added inducement to purchase it was the following announcement:

N.B. There will be a handsome Allowance (in this Edition) to all such who shall take a Number to be disposed of charitably.

There was a second issue of this pocket edition in 1750, published by John and James Rivington, and another in 1763. This 1763 edition in particular raises some interesting speculations. It has the same short preface as the earlier pocket editions, but is a duodecimo, with 254 pages—the others had been 24mo. Its title-page runs:

The Christian's Pattern: or, a Treatise of the Imitation of Christ. Translated from the Latin of Thomas à Kempis. Compared with the Original, and Corrected throughout, by John Wesley, M.A. Late Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxon. And afterwards revised by an eminent Divine of the Church of England. London: Printed for John Rivington, at the Bible and Crown in St. Paul's Church Yard. 1763.

The phrase about the 'eminent Divine of the Church of England' is particularly intriguing. In an Additional Note to his

Wesley Bibliography, Rev. Richard Green suggested that it referred to Dr. Heylin, whom John Byrom says was 'over-looking' the translation with Wesley. This remark about Heylin's connection with the proposed edition of Kempis, however, was made by Byrom in 1734, *before* the book was published. Nothing is said about any such revision in the large 1735 edition, nor, apparently, in the 1735 and 1750 pocket editions. Why should such a revision, if it actually occurred, first be mentioned in 1763? The following alternative theory is put forward, albeit diffidently, to account for this apparent desire on Wesley's part to have his work 'Approved by Authority'—a proceeding very unlike him, to say the least of it! First of all, however, it is necessary to understand something more of Wesley's relationships with the well-known publishing house of Rivington's.

It is known that the publisher Charles Rivington was the friend of the Wesleys, and of Whitefield too, but — and this fact must be stressed—only so long as they could safely be regarded as future pillars of the Church of England. Rivington had become associated with John Wesley over the task of seeing Samuel Wesley's *Dissertations on Job* safely through the press. Scholarly labours such as this and the translation of Thomas à Kempis were fitting for loyal sons of the Church. But as the hearts of the young Oxford Methodists became warmed, so did Rivington's affection for them begin to cool. He scented the dreaded 'enthusiasm' in the air, and ceased to publish their writings.

Wesley's diary shows that after his 'evangelical conversion' he still paid occasional calls on Rivington. He was at Rivington's house on September 23 following that experience, and on January 29, 1739, drank coffee and 'conversed' with him. (It must be remembered that the entry 'conversed' in Wesley's diary nearly always refers to deep and searching conversation on spiritual things.) Finally, Wesley again 'conversed' with Rivington for over an hour on the morning of July 5, 1740. Is it significant that this last visit

was made the moment Wesley had put the final touches to his Preface for the 1740 *Hymns and Sacred Poems*, a Preface on which he had been occupied during the preceding three days, and in which he described the way of salvation in phrases that in later years he felt compelled to modify? It does seem just possible that Wesley was making a special point of revealing his more extreme sentiments to Rivington in black and white, and then challenging Rivington, knowing the worst, to associate himself with them as a publisher. If so, the inevitable happened. Rivington refused the untempting offer, preferring his orthodox security to the hazards of 'Methodist enthusiasm', and the hymns were published by James Hutton alone.

At any rate that same year of 1740 saw the friendship between Wesley and Rivington dissolved, and at the end of the year Rivington's name appeared on the title-page of a book entitled 'The Imposture of Methodism Displayed'. After Charles Rivington's death in 1742 the breach remained unhealed, and the firm continued to publish some of the more substantial attacks on Methodism (see Green's *Anti-Methodist Publications*, Nos. 94, 131, 150, 282, 294, 327, 452). One cannot wonder, in view of this, that after 1735 none of Wesley's writings were entrusted to the firm, especially as he had got into touch with printers and publishers having something of his own evangelical outlook, men like James Hutton, John Lewis, and the Farleys of Bristol. Why then, one naturally asks, the seeming exception in the case of the two pocket editions of Kempis? The answer is fairly simple, and leads us onward to the solution of the revision problem. In the first place, the *Christian's Pattern* was a 'safe' book, its orthodoxy unimpeached. In the second place, it was almost certainly reprinted without any consultation with Wesley, and without his receiving any of the proceeds.

The suggested sequence of events may now be outlined thus. In 1735 Charles Rivington published Wesley's Kempis, including a pocket edition. By 1740 his relationships with Wesley ceased. Kempis was a steady seller, and Wesley's edition had

a good market, so that when 'John and James Rivington', Charles's sons and successors, found that the firm's stocks of the pocket edition were getting low, they decided to reprint, most probably without consulting Wesley. This was in 1750. By 1763 a further reprint seemed necessary. The outward circumstances had changed, however. Wesley had since become a national figure, and one largely rejected by the Established Church, whilst the sedate and supremely orthodox John Rivington was no longer associated with his more harum-scarum brother James. John believed in playing for safety. Accordingly, in the title-page of this new edition, he inserted the phrase which showed that, though originally produced by that notorious iconoclast John Wesley, the book had nevertheless received the blessing of Mother Church through its revision 'by an eminent Divine of the Church of England'. He *may* have done this on the strength of Dr. Heylin's possible association with the book before its first publication, but this seems very unlikely. More probably Rivington himself persuaded 'an eminent Divine' to glance over the book, and revise it slightly. He knew plenty. Archbishop Secker, for instance, was a great friend of his, and they breakfasted together at Lambeth every fortnight. Either Secker, or one of Rivington's other episcopal friends, would willingly undertake this light task in order to protect him from the slightest suspicion of having sponsored an unorthodox book.

Thus it seems likely that after 1735 Wesley was no longer much concerned about the fate of his complete edition of Kempis. Possibly he looked upon it as the literary property of the Rivington's, although the copyright laws were in a state of flux, and one cannot feel at all certain about this. He was the less inclined to trouble about any republication of the volume as it stood, because after his 1738 experience he had become the practical evangelist, intent on saving England in spite of itself. In that role he had come to believe that an abridged and expurgated edition, though less satisfactory from a literary standpoint, would be more generally serviceable. Such an

edition he accordingly prepared. It was published (by James Hutton and John Lewis) in 1741, a duodecimo volume of 130 pages, price eightpence. Wesley entitled the book 'An Extract of the Christian's Pattern', and in preparing it omitted from the complete edition the Preface, the Contents, and twenty-eight chapters in various parts of the work. This was the edition which at the 1746 Conference Wesley urged his preachers to use for their devotional reading from four until five in the morning, and from five until six in the evening. This was the edition which Wesley tried to preserve for posterity in volume 7 of his 1771-74 *Works*, though abridged a little more, and, like the rest of those *Works*, very inaccurately printed. This, also, was the edition which Wesley was continually recommending his preachers to sell, and his people to buy. In the various *Minutes of Conference*, and in private letters, such sentences as the following were continually occurring:

The societies are not half supplied with books; not even with *Kempis*, *Instructions for Children*, and *Primitive Physick*, which ought to be in every house. (*Large Minutes*, 1763.)

I wish you would everywhere recommend two books in particular—*The Christian Pattern* and the *Primitive Physick*. It is a great pity that any Methodist should be without them. (Letter to George Merryweather, January 24, 1760.)

It seems that in these two books Wesley believed that he had a panacea for all human ills, those of the soul in one, and of the body in the other.

The *Extract of the Christian's Pattern* has been reprinted a score of times, in Wesley's own day, and even during the present century. In 1811 the Book Room had on sale an edition in three bindings, one costing 1s., another, with red edges, being priced at 1s. 2d., whilst the edition de luxe, bound in calf, cost 1s. 6d. Besides the official publications, various publishers from time to time have issued Wesley's *Kempis* as a private venture, and apparently found it successful. Such is an edition recently brought to light in the *Proceedings* of the Wesley Historical Society, with the imprint

'Derby: Printed by and for Henry Mosley, Brook Street, 1815'. The writer of this article has been interested in examining another modern re-issue. It is No. 16 of 'The Simple Life Series', a small octavo volume of 96 pages, and is described as 'A reprint of the 1777 edition of Wesley's translation of this famous devotional work, differing greatly in tone from other translations, and at present hardly known'. The imprint is 'London: Arthur C. Fifield. The Simple Life Press. 44 Fleet Street, E.C. 1905'. A facsimile of the 1777 title-page is given on the verso of the modern one. A few words by the publisher follow Wesley's short preface:

The book has almost been lost sight of for many years, however; and it is now re-issued in the hope that its plain, earnest style; its practical form, and its association with the name of Wesley, may commend it to many who cannot sympathize with the monastic tone of the complete work.

The influence of Wesley's Kempis was not confined to the British Isles. His preachers took supplies of it with them to America, supplies which were found to be inadequate. On July 28, 1775, under the gathering clouds of the War of American Independence, Wesley wrote to the 'superintendent' of American Methodism, Thomas Rankin:

You may print an edition of the *Christian Pattern*, and apply the profits of it to the payment of the debt. The Societies should pay the passage of the preachers. But you must not imagine that any more of them will come to America till these troubles are at an end.

Such permission was necessary, because Wesley was determined to exercise supervision over Methodist printing in America, as he did in England; he had already administered a rebuke to Robert Williams for printing and distributing Wesley's *Sermons* in America without the author's permission. Whether Rankin made use of Wesley's permission we do not know. When the 'Methodist Book Concern' of the Methodist Episcopal Church was established in 1789, however, under the leadership of John Dickins, its first publication was Wesley's *Extract of the Christian's Pattern*.

A still smaller extract from Kempis was published by Wesley in 1742. It was called 'A Companion for the Altar. Extracted from Thomas à Kempis'. As the name suggests, this was taken from Book Four of the *Imitation*, which deals with the Lord's Supper. It consists of the 1741 extract, still further abridged, making a twenty-four-page tract of preparation for receiving the Holy Communion. It sold at twopence, and went through numerous editions, being still on sale by the Book Room at the same price in 1811.

Wesley did not content himself with catering for the uneducated many. In 1748 he also published a Latin edition of Kempis for the privileged few. It was prepared chiefly, of course, for the scholars of the newly established Kingswood School. The title was 'Thomae a Kempis de Christo Imitando. Libri Tres. Edidit Ecclesiae Anglicanae Presbyter'. This duodecimo of 143 pages is seldom met with now, and was apparently never reprinted. Green says that 'it displays very careful editing'. Once again, this edition is an abridgement of the original. The fourth class at Kingswood was set to read and learn this from nine until ten in the morning, and at one in the afternoon, whilst at four in the afternoon the scholars had to translate it into English. Wesley obviously trusted the Kingswood boys not to make use of the 'cribs' which he had already published so bountifully!

A writer in the *Proceedings* of the Wesley Historical Society (vol. 12, p. 33) points out that although Wesley depended on Sebastian Castellio for the Latin edition of Kempis published for Kingswood School, he was also familiar with 'Lambinet's, which was used for the beautiful Pickering edition of 1827'. This fact is shown by a detailed examination of a quotation of Kempis in Latin which occurs in the *Journal* (Standard Edition, vol. v, p. 62). There are other quotations from Kempis, both in Latin and English, scattered throughout Wesley's *Journal*, *Letters*, and *Works*, which might shed further light on Wesley's relationships with Kempis. The hymns also contain many phrases reminiscent of the *Imitation*.

Undoubtedly this famous book exerted an important and permanent influence on Wesley's thought and devotion. One of his last letters, written on October 23, 1790, to James Macdonald, closes with a quotation from Kempis which might well serve as an epitaph for Wesley's own life—'The more thou deniest thyself, the more thou wilt grow in grace'. This was a principle, learned largely from Kempis, which shaped Wesley's activities to the end. By his physical self-denial and his spiritual growth John Wesley proved himself one of Kempis's truest disciples, though most certainly not a slavish worshipper of his teaching in its entirety.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CONSULTED

- BYROM, JOHN. *Journal and Literary Remains*. (Chetham Society, 4 vols.)
 Catalogue of Wesleyana at the Book Room, 1921.
 CHRISTIE, R. C. *Bibliography of the Works of Dr. John Worthington*.
 CROWTHER, JONATHAN. *Portraiture of Methodism*.
Dictionary of National Biography.
Encyclopaedia Britannica (14th edition).
Gentleman's Magazine, 1813, Part 2 (containing articles on the various editions of Kempis).
 GREEN, RICHARD. *Wesley Bibliography*, 2nd edition, 1906; *Anti-Methodist Publications*, 1902.
 HOOLE, REV. DR. *Byrom and the Wesleys*, 1864.
 KEMPIS, THOMAS À. Various editions, as quoted in the text, the 1763 one by the kindness of Rev. F. F. Bretherton, B.A., Secretary of the Wesley Historical Society.
Large Minutes, 1763.
New History of Methodism, 2 vols.
 OSBORN, G. *Outlines of Wesleyan Bibliography*.
Proceedings and Publication I of the Wesley Historical Society.
 RIVINGTON, S. *The Publishing Family of Rivington*, 1919
 TYERMAN, LUKE. *Life and Times of Wesley*, 3 vols.
 WATT, ROBERT. *Bibliotheca Britannica*, 4 vols.
 WESLEY, JOHN. *Journal* (Standard edition, 8 vols.); *Letters* (Standard edition, 8 vols.); *Works* (14 vols. 1829-31); *A Short Account of the School in Kingswood*, 1749.
 WESLEY, JOHN and CHARLES. *Poetical Works* (13 vols. ed. G. Osborn).
Wesley Studies, 1903.
 WHEATLEY, C. A. *The Story of the Imitatio Christi*.

FRANK BAKER

Notes and Discussions

SCOTTISH DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE AND ITS MODERN RELEVANCE

HENRY SCOUGAL OF ABERDEEN

WASN'T it Charles Lamb who said that when a new book came out he invariably read an old one? He was an incorrigible antiquarian. But there is something to be said for his bias. Much of the literature that pours from the press to-day is of an ephemeral kind, and often as thoughtless as the latest song-hit on the wireless. To some lesser extent is this true of present-day publications under the heading of theology, particularly of the so-called popular books. These are frequently surface volumes; they want depth. Or else they are so clearly dated that, in the course of a year or so, they become sadly outmoded. True theology can never have these things said about it. For this reason we may doubt whether our forefathers would recognize half the modern literature bearing the theological label as theology at all.

These convictions have been strengthened by the writer's acquaintance with some of the devotional classics of Scotland. He has found in this neglected field of religious thought and feeling some of the best practical theology he has ever read. Despite the fact that much of it was written in the seventeenth century, in a time of religious controversy and civic upheaval, it reflects few of these datable elements, and shows a remarkable catholicity of feeling and modernity of outlook. This literature, much of it in old lambskin tomes long since out of print, is, nevertheless, right up to date because it deals with the abiding verities of the Christian Faith which are the same in every age.

A writer recently said that he is always suspicious of anything that claims to be new in the sphere of theology. He meant that the wider our theological acquaintance, the more convinced we become of the impossibility of anything novel in this universal field of experience. Human history is of a piece, and the date and the age make little difference. All this has been brought to the mind of the present writer by reading the works of Henry Scougal. During the blackout he picked up Scougal's *Life of God in the Soul of Man* written during the author's short ministry at Auchterless 1673-74. That little book, which affected a spiritual upheaval in the lives of men like Wesley, Whitefield, and Newton, is not without relevance to-day when even the pillars of the Church are making the vagaries of analytical psychology the handmaid, if not the substitute, of the life of Christian devotion. A wide re-reading of this little book, with its Christo-centric theme, would prove to be a salutary experience.

Scougal's sermons, also, are remarkably up to date. In one of these, with the title, 'The Indispensable Duty of Loving our Enemies', we find this passage so relevant at this hour:

As for the enemies of our country, I see no warrant to exclude them from our charity; we may indeed lawfully oppose their violent invasion, and defend our rights with the sword . . . but all this may be done with as little malice and hatred as a judge may punish a malefactor; the general may be as void of passion as a lord chief justice, and the soldier as the executioner. But charity will oblige a prince never to have recourse to the sword till all other remedies fail, to blunt the edge of war by sparing, as much as may be, the shedding of innocent blood, with all other barbarities that used to accompany it, and to accept of any reasonable capitulation.

Who would think those words, some of the wisest we could read anywhere to-day, on the relation of Christianity to war, were written in the seventeenth century? Scougal also shows a unique catholicity of outlook, in some ways not unlike the seventeenth-century devotional writer John Donne, but without the latter's underlying interest in controversy. It is a surprising phenomenon, this catholicity, in an age that was in so many ways marked by narrowness. But here it is in one of Scougal's discourses:

You may find some who agree in opinion, and only differ in several ways of expressing the same thing, and yet can scarce look on one another without displeasure and aversion. But alas! how much do these men disparage that religion for which they appear so zealous! How much do they mistake the spirit of Christianity . . . Certainly the power of religion, rightly prevailing in the soul, would mould us into another temper; it would teach us to love and pity and pray for the person, as well as hate and condemn the errors they are supposed to espouse; it would make us wish their conversion, rather than their confusion, and be more desirous that God would fit them for another world than that He would take them out of this. We may indeed wish the disappointment of their wicked purposes; for this is charity to them, to keep them from being the unhappy instruments of mischief in the world, but he that can wish plagues and ruin to their persons, and delights in their sins, or in their misery, hath more of the Devil than the Christian.

To read Scougal is to feel that he was a man born out of his time. That is indeed the feeling one gets on dipping into the letters of Rutherford, or the sanctified prose of William Guthrie. These men walked the earth, but their hearts and minds were in the eternal dwelling-place of God. Would not British religious life be enriched by a re-reading of its devotional classics?

HARRY ESCOTT

PREDATORY PRUSSIA AND MOMMSEN'S LAW

THE glorification of power politics that has reached its acme in Nazidom is a throw-back to medieval pagan feudalism. It had its first apparent justification by results in the uprise of Prussia under Frederick the Great. The will to power never burnt more strongly in any modern, or was allied to a more penetrating mind. In him Prussia became impersonate, and every interest of his State he was alive to, save one, its moral and religious interest. To increase its wealth and power, and to spread its dominion, he spent all his powers regardless of everything. That meant that first of all Prussia's army should be made as perfect a military machine as the severest discipline and the financial resources of Prussia could secure. The military discipline he learnt from his extremely strict and fantastically-minded father. And by a fluke he gained, through that father's severe punishment, a thorough understanding of the resources of his country; so that he was familiar with the system of taxation to its lowest details, and knew when, where, and how to economize its expenditure, and to add to its resources. New developments in agriculture and industry were studied by him with the utmost care, and the balance of military expenditure and the power to supply for it, whether by agriculture or manufactures, was kept true enough to secure in the end the hegemony of Prussia in the loosely organized Holy Roman Empire. In the upshot, we see at last the substitution of Berlin for Vienna.

Little did Englishmen dream who the man was, and what the outcome of his ideas and temper would be, who delighted in the triumph of Frederick as that of a Christian and protestant prince. They needed to be saved from their friend and to take care of their enemies themselves. *Nec defensoribus istis*. The long struggle of Frederick to secure Silesia, to ward off the danger of the Mongols of the Russian Empire—to appease Russian greed and satisfy his own land-hunger by dividing and destroying the Polish nation—and the spectacle of unwearying endeavour in defeat and success to gain ultimate victory in the Seven Years War, acted as an opiate on not only the Prussian but the European mind. The spirit and aims and principles of Frederick became sacrosanct in Prussia; he was Frederick the Great *there*, and soon to be in Europe. In England his indomitable courage and skill made Carlyle drunk with admiration, so that he lost his way in estimating Frederick's value to the race, and made him forget that the Nazarene has set the only real and final standard for man, whether as an individual or as a member of the Kingdom of the Universe. He forgot that Holiness becomes that Kingdom and any man or nation that ignores that fact is foredoomed to perish. 'Righteousness and judgement are the foundation' of all valid rule. Anything else is a usurpation—a dream, an illusion, ending in bottomless perdition.

The subsequent rise of Napoleon and his final destruction did not

teach the worldly mind of Europe. Not even the moralizings of Napoleon in St. Helena on the fatuity of his own power politics, as compared with the principle of love and unselfishness laid down by the Master, could gain any serious consideration by politician or soldier on the continent of Europe. The rise of Methodism in England recalled our people to the study of original Christianity, and the moral philosophy of Butler directed their attention to the actual groundwork of human nature. Conscience was a fact, free will was a fact, the golden rule was an axiom: every man appealed to that rule for himself, and by so much as he did so he was self-judged in regard to his personal behaviour. Had conscience and that golden rule sway as they had right, then would they rule the world. So Butler thundered.

Butler among the intellectuals, and Wesley and his preachers among the plain people, interpreted and fixed the Gospel of Christ in the English mind as to the behaviour of men and nations here and their destination finally in security or disaster hereafter. The fundamental glory and wonder of a human soul as God's child, redeemed from sin by the blood of Christ, and capable of being filled with the spirit of Christ and of producing the selfless example of Christ, dawned afresh on myriads of minds and altered absolutely all their values. The worth of the soul was seen afresh interpreted through God and in Christ crucified. In all this the English race shared on both sides of the Atlantic. A new missionary enthusiasm broke out, and the freedom of the slave announced a new world. Violent reactions ensued, and in the end the American War sealed in Lincoln's day the freedom of man and the keeping of interstate covenants. Truth and Justice and Liberty were sealed for ever as man's inalienable birthright by the bullet that killed Lincoln.

But in Germany there was no equal movement. The pietists of the same period did not leaven to the same degree the national mind: the structure of the German states, and especially of Prussia, was far from the English type. The England of the Industrial Revolution had evolved a Government where the balance of power had quietly shifted to the side of the common people. The prince and his aristocrats and cabinet of official ministers counted for less and the House of Commons for more. Constitutional government had become a reality. The people at last governed the people through the Government. Gladstone could suggest to the Queen what it would have been an unpardonable sin to have done in a Prussian court, namely, that he represented the people of England. The truth was out, but neither quite forgave the other for forcing things to an issue. The Queen could never give, nor Gladstone take, a title after that. Her last letter to him revealed the fact of an unfathomable gulf between them.

But in Prussia political rule had hardly attained the position of the English Government in Jacobean times. Henry VIII had to pay very serious attention to parliamentary opinion, increasingly more had his descendants to do. Frederick the Great listened to his ministers and

to the Parliament, but never conceded the right of initiative to the one or the other. He was himself the 'first servant of the State', but what was best to be done for its welfare at any given juncture, he himself determined. And as to peace or war with states outside his own, that also lay with him. And in connection with that there was kept always in the background of his mind, and in that of those who acted with and for him, the idea that aggressive warfare for extension of territory, and to secure what was regarded as the interests of the State, was justifiable, quite apart from any moral issue. There was no law forbidding thief or murderer, if the criminal committed his crime under a uniform. The State and its head owned no court of appeal. 'L'état, c'est moi' was Frederick's as well as the Grand Monarch's self-approved summing up of the legal situation.

And the whole mental life of Prussia seemed to give its assent to this unmoral and immoral doctrine. University, Church, and State, all alike, kept a conspiracy of silence on this question. The State was not subject to a moral law: thou must, or must not, dare not be addressed to it. The majesty of God and His law was not to be pleaded in a chancellor's or king's court.

How far this had gone by the middle of the nineteenth century may be shown by a passage taken from Theodor Mommsen's *History of Rome*, book five, chapter seven, on the subjugation of the West, and especially on the conquest of what is now France by the Romans, and their first contact with Germany and Great Britain. This is the kind of stuff on which the mind of the Prussian nobility was brought up in its university life, and explains the mentality that created the *blut und eisen* policy of Bismarck, its outworking in 1871 and 1914 and is now risen again with greater truculence than ever. This is Mommsen's point of view as he regards the evolution of world history:

'By virtue of the law, that a people which has grown into a State absorbs its neighbours who are in political nonage, and a civilized people absorbs its neighbours who are in intellectual nonage—by virtue of this law, which is as universally valid, and as much a law of nature as the law of gravity—the Italian nation (the only one in antiquity which was able to combine a superior political development and a superior civilization, though it presented the latter only in an imperfect and external manner) was entitled to reduce to subjection the Greek states of the East which were ripe for destruction, and to dispossess the peoples of lower grades of culture in the West—Libyans, Iberians, Celts, Germans—by means of its settlers; just as England with equal right has in Asia reduced to subjection a civilization of rival standing but politically impotent, and in America and Australia has marked and ennobled, and continues to mark and ennoble, extensive barbarian countries with the impress of its nationality. The Roman aristocracy had accomplished the pre-

liminary condition required for this task—the union of Italy; the task itself it never solved, but always regarded the extra-Italian conquests either as simply a necessary evil, or as a fiscal necessity virtually beyond the pale of the State. It is the imperishable glory of the Roman democracy or monarchy—for the two coincide—to have correctly apprehended and vigorously realized this its highest destination. What the irresistible force of circumstances paved the way for . . . the creator of the Roman democracy Gaius Gracchus recognized and began to carry out with statesmanlike clearness and decision.'

Setting aside his parallel of England for the present, without prejudice, this point of view was that presented as the normal one in the training of the Germans who were in their university courses in the sixties of the last century. How deeply it affected all Prussian and German minds may be noted by a simple incident that occurred in the widely experienced life of an old English military officer who happened to be staying in the schloss of a German aristocrat. Quite unconcernedly in the midst of conversation the German said, in talking of political prospects for the Fatherland: 'And of course the Reich will eventually absorb Belgium and Holland and Denmark.' Roused by the light assumption of so grievous a possibility, the English officer said: 'That means war', and as he told the story the word 'war' was a deep yell. The German assented unconcernedly.

We all know to-day how greatly we misunderstood the German, and especially the predominantly German, that is, the Prussian mind. With Luther's Bible in their hands, and with a Lutheran Church State-recognized, how little the teaching of the Gospel and the spirit and mind of Christ had transformed the North German common thought and feeling when it came to action! And the same was true of Catholic life farther south. Brutality and cruelty that was never surpassed has stained for ever the German record in Poland, and in the invasion of the Low Countries and France, and elsewhere.

But all has grown up out of an indifference to moral considerations, and is a lesson to the democracies of the world that they cannot with impunity be indifferent to the claims of religion and morality in the choice of their representatives. It was said by Lincoln that no man ever came to the Presidency of the United States of America that ignored or was indifferent to those claims. 'On God and godlike men we put our trust', wrote Wordsworth. To do so was to him building a nation on the very nature of things. And again he wrote:

To the solid ground of nature
Trusts the mind that builds for aye.

The issue for the world to-day is 'Either Christ or nothing' as for the Roman it was 'Aut Caesar aut nihil'. God and duty are supreme, and God to us equates Christ.

JAMES LEWIS

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

TWO MASTERS OF TRINITY

Last of the Victorians: First of the Moderns

Now that we have mourned the passing of another famous figure, Sir J. J. Thomson, O.M., I should like to record one or two vivid personal memories of some thirty-five years ago. My diary states that on November 23, 1905, I was present, as a Trinity undergrad., at a popular lecture in the great dining-hall, by the Cavendish Professor ('J. J.') on 'The Atom and its Structure'.

For those able to take an intelligent interest in such recondite matters as the discovery of the electron it was all very thrilling; but, alas! for others, as ignorant of Science as myself, it was another thing, though the lantern slides certainly were very remarkable. Looking back over the years, however, I seem to see it now as the meeting-point of two ages, with two figures as symbolical: the Chairman, the patriarchal Montagu Butler, a great Christian Humanist, and the brilliant Professor, representing the new and portentous age of Science. And of course we none of us knew then that in a few years' time the one would succeed the other in the Mastership.

Who could hope to convey the unique, wellnigh overwhelming impression made by the radiant dominating figure of Henry Montagu Butler? ('We do it wrong being so majestic'!) Even we who only saw him on occasion felt sure that here was a truly great and good man, physically, intellectually, and spiritually. He preserved through a long and brilliantly successful life the simplicity and sincerity of the childlike spirit; his immense gifts were all touched to finer issues by that one thing. And what silver-tongued eloquence! I hear again in imagination that exquisite little speech of thanks to the lecturer; how he apologized for his own ignorance of Science but proceeded to give us a few delightful personal reminiscences of Clerk Maxwell (one of his great friends) and other famous figures of the past. It was truly a breath from that older world, more spacious and more gracious than ours . . . And, great Anglican though he was, there was no mistaking the master's very real interest in and appreciation of the work of the Free Churches. His lecture on John Wesley, one of his many heroes, was surely a superb model of its kind.

Of his successor in the Mastership, Sir J. J. Thomson, I am hardly qualified to speak. One did hear a little about him from some of his pupils, and 'J. J.' himself was a fairly familiar figure; an ordinary matter-of-fact, friendly-looking sort of man, so he appeared to me, with nothing at all impressive about him except perhaps that immense brow. One understood vaguely that wonderful things were being done at the Cavendish laboratory, but I suppose that very few at that time could appreciate the true greatness of the master mind that was revealing new wonders of this mysterious universe.

Truly they were a wonderful pair, two great and good men, so utterly

different superficially yet each one true to his own vocation. I shall always link them together in affectionate remembrance, the last of the Victorians and the first of the moderns; forerunners, let us hope, of that true synthesis of Science and the Humanities for which the world still waits. Perhaps their successor, Professor G. M. Trevelyan, who has recently been installed with all the traditional ceremony, will greatly help us towards that shadowy ideal.

CHARLES GIMBLETT

HUMANITY—OLD AND NEW

PHILOSOPHERS, as one of them has told us, must be spectators of all time and existence, and, presumably, of every place. We men are the children of our own period. We are immured in our own affairs. We see our own dangers and loop-holes of escape in a close-up view. But he who is to help us to see life as we need to see it, to see it, so to speak, solemnly and whole, must first be himself detached. He will be the child of no one age. Our to-days will mean no more to him than our yesterdays. He must be so far like the Almighty that one day to him shall be as a thousand years. He will appraise as carefully the events in the dawn of history on this Continent as the headlines in this morning's newspaper.

But is this possible? Can we take our own environment and ourselves along with it and fit it into a scheme of universal history? The prospect of doing so will always be alluring; and Mr. D. R. Davies, the author of the widely read *On to Orthodoxy*, has recently been dealing, as he has expressed it, with the meaning of events in their historical setting and movement and making an attempt at 'Christian interpretation of history in the light of the war'.¹ Who would not wish to watch such an attempt and to learn from it? Strangely, the volume contains no date, either on the title-page or in the preface; but a quotation on page 12 from a newspaper of September 3, 1939, and the absence of any reference to the downfall of France, an event which might have enforced some of the author's arguments, date the book for future readers within reasonable limits. And Mr. Davies is clear that in 'a collapsing civilization' such as involves us all to-day in its threatening ruin, there is no hope for us save in a supernatural re-creating intervention.

This thesis recalls Mr. Davies's previous book. There he gave us the story of his own spiritual pilgrimage. With his passionate Welsh nature, eager for social reform, longing to build the Kingdom of God in the waste places of our bleak industrial society, he describes how he had been led by the catchwords of current liberal thought; all a man needs is to be cut loose from the shackles of his early training or environment; and the divine within him will realize itself. Not sin, but misdirection,

¹ *The Two Humanities*, by D. R. Davies. James Clarke. 1940. 7s. 6d.

is his bane. And then Mr. Davies made the discovery of his life: that all this heady stuff led nowhere; that life is tied up to the great facts of sin, helplessness, and redemption: and that orthodoxy (by which Mr. Davies really meant the traditional evangelical 'plan of salvation' or something like it) was the only compass by which a man could steer for safety here or hereafter. He had the compass. He writes in the tone of the initiate in the Greek mysteries: 'I have escaped evil; I have found some better thing.'

And what was the evil? The belief, put shortly, that man can save himself; that human nature is perfectible or even progressive. This is the belief that Mr. Davies calls Liberalism, or Liberal Christianity, or Christian Liberalism; which, in the nineteenth century, 'perpetrated the unbelievable vulgarity of identifying historic Providence with Evolution—and Darwinian evolution at that'; that 'in spite of himself man was destined for utopia on earth'; it is the smug confidence of the investor in the celestial bank (for Mr. Davies too must have his fling at the unhappy 'liberal' Bishop Wordsworth)—'Whatever, Lord, we lend to Thee repaid a thousand-fold will be'. It denied the Fall; it denied sin; it denied hell; it misunderstood human freedom; it could not distinguish between the facts of nineteenth-century science and its philosophy. Its prophet in Germany was Adolf Harnack; with R. J. Campbell as a kind of apostle in England; and Adolf Harnack may prove, in his effects on life, to be not so very far behind Adolf Hitler!

In thus taking up his parable against liberalism, Mr. Davies will have many sympathizers. Liberalism in theology has few defenders to-day. We are most of us ready to repeat the scornful language of Newman and the Tractarians. What we have not decided is what we mean precisely by liberalism in theology; and why it is so different from the liberalism which many of us suppose to lie at the heart of democracy. Are there two liberalisms, issuing from the same womb—a Jacob and an Esau, a Cain and an Abel? And it does us little honour to forget that what liberalism fought for two generations ago we all of us take for granted, as far as the interpretation of Scripture is concerned, and that those who uncritically deride liberalism in theology may find themselves in the camp of reactionaries.

Mr. Davies, however, has no doubts about theological liberalism. In the present book he applies the discovery he had made in his own life to the world which is rushing us all into perdition. For these recent months, since September of last year, he says, have shown us all where we stand. 'War is the final term of any civilization'; but it would seem that it is the present war of which this statement is pre-eminently true. We are all involved in its guilt. There was not a spice of generosity, he says, about Versailles. We are indirectly as guilty as Hitler is directly. 'We can to-day quite easily see the untruth of the modern estimate of human nature.' 'The war' (this war—presumably) 'proves conclusively two things: the inability of man to ensure unhindered progress; and the

existence in human nature of some radical evil and irrationality'—the irrationality consisting in the fact that no one wanted the war at all. After all, a good many reputable thinkers held these two statements as proved before September 1939. Liberal Christianity, urges Mr. Davies, has deceived mankind; and the war has at last shown up the deception. In human nature, the author has no hope; in God's power to re-create man, he has absolute certainty.

With these words, few who call themselves Christians would think of quarrelling. It was not given to Karl Barth to make the discovery that man might feel himself tied to a corpse. But what do we mean by this human nature? Why is it so helpless? And what does God do when He re-creates it? No one can blame Mr. Davies if he does not answer these questions. Truth to tell, few among our professed theologians have seriously made the attempt. And Mr. Davies's book may serve to show, in another sense perhaps than he intended, why the doctrine of the Fall (Mr. Davies would call it a fact and a dogma) has been so sadly uninfluential. To Mr. Davies, the Fall is man's 'assertion of his independence from God, and of his freedom to live by his own resources and out of his own being'. 'As a result of sin, personality fell into primeval depths.' 'Tribal man was far below original man.' 'Man is in revolt, exercising his freedom.' To Mr. Davies, freedom means suffering: 'modern man' avoids it as much as he can; but in the end he will voluntarily submit to God.

It is Liberal Christianity, however, or Christian Liberalism, or Modernism, which has seduced the modern man and played the arch-sophist. The Middle Ages had imprisoned man in reason (not in superstition!). The Reformation broke down medieval feudalism; but the Renaissance set man 'pursuing his career of independence from and opposition to God'; and in spite of the 'reformer', Calvin, Capitalism and Protestantism ('Protestantism is capitalism upon its knees') drove him further on, 'draping in Christian garb Liberal middle-class morality'; and by its 'fatal and false underestimation of sin and its dissolution of man's absolute freedom', accomplished the disappearance of hell, although 'the very possibility of hell is the price man has to pay for freedom'.

The alliance (if it is not something more) between Protestantism and Calvinism and Capitalism has been made familiar to us by several able modern writers, such as Max Weber and R. H. Tawney, to say nothing of Emil Brunner; but a careful writer will remember that it was Luther and Calvin who rediscovered Augustine and Paul. The Fall, sin, and hell have filled a considerably larger space in Protestant writings than in either the Middle Ages or modern Catholicism. On freedom, the reader will probably have some difficulty in divining Mr. Davies's real view. He has obviously caught at Berdyaev's curious adjective 'meonic', but he can hardly be blamed if he has not caught what Berdyaev meant by it himself. On the other hand, a writer who lays Mr. Davies's stress

on the Fall cannot complain if he is asked whether the Fall is to be regarded as an event in time. Has Mr. Davies read Dr. N. P. Williams' discussion of that perplexing question? Apparently it is to be taken as matter of history, for we have: first, 'original man', then 'early historical man', and then 'the man in whom personal self-consciousness had risen from its depths' and so was ripe for the coming of Christ. But this development (whatever 'personal self-consciousness' means) could of itself do nothing; it left the old humanity where it was. And 'modern man has treated the Bible teaching of man in somewhat the same fashion as jazz has treated classical music'. (Competent musicians, we believe, have differing ideas about that fashion.) 'Liberal Christianity has overlaid the Biblical teaching with the intellectual products of an anti-Christian civilization.' Hence it is clear that there must be some outside help. We see at last clearly the 'two humanities'. 'There is the old humanity; man fallen through his sin and painfully exhausting his capacity in the tragedy of history. There is the new humanity of Christ's redeeming life, death, and resurrection': or, as the author puts it a little later (though does he mean the same thing?) 'since the coming of Christ, the old humanity is penetrated by a new'.

For Mr. Davies, this is central. It gives the title to his book. This causes the more regret that such an elusive word should have been chosen for this purpose. If only our popular theologians could bring themselves to eschew the use of abstract terms! Mr. Davies has indeed, like many other writers, his difficulties with 'personality'. But what does humanity (old or new) stand for? All human beings? Or a class of human beings? Or a type of human being, which may or may not have been actually realized? Is Mr. Davies a conceptualist or a realist or a nominalist? Or is humanity a way of life pursued or to be pursued by certain human beings? And when Christ is said to have created a new humanity, what did He actually do? The nearest Mr. Davies gets to this is in his saying that the distinction between old humanity and new (here the definite article drops out) is 'erased when we fit our loyalty to the nation into our loyalty to Christ'. But it would seem that whatever humanity means when it is called 'old', it must mean something different when it is called 'new'. We are not really helped when we are told that humanity, re-created by God in Christ, is 'the corporate totality of human beings who have become capable of a new development', since 'human beings do not exist in isolation'. (It was one of the egregious errors of Protestantism to suppose that men could be saved as individuals.) Nor are we helped by being told that 'in the man Jesus God assumed humanity'. Which humanity, the old or the new? Again, we must decide to be born anew. Yet this is beyond human power. So man's response can only be one of despair; yet of belief in a God able and willing to supply what man has at last realized that he himself can never provide. Such a belief, we must understand, is at once intellectual, moral, dogmatic. For 'original sin is a fact (dogma); human inability to

overcome it is a fact (dogma); the existence of God the creator, judge and re-creator, in Christ is a fact (dogma)'.

And so we pass from the corporate totality of human beings to an intensely individual experience, for the descriptions of which Mr. Davies is for the most part indebted to more or less modern Protestants. But does this mean that the new humanity is composed of individuals who have passed through that experience and no others? That is what Mr. Davies appears to mean. Surely the statement needs no refutation. Such a class would exclude multitudes of whose genuine conversion and salvation no reasonable evangelical could be in doubt. And even Mr. Davies talks about potentiality. But if we are to take this word in Mr. Davies's sense, it would seem that the whole of mankind throughout the Christian era must be included in the new humanity.

So the pendulum swings backwards and forwards. No one can fail to recognize Mr. Davies's intense earnestness; his enthusiastic loyalty to certain recent (we must not say, modern) writers whom he has taken to his heart—not forgetting Dostoevsky's fable of the Grand Inquisitor, which meets us at least a dozen times in these pages. Far be it from me to wish to confine the writing of theological books to those who have had some definite theological training; though why this licence should be allowed in theology when it is forbidden, say, to medicine, I do not know. After all, it is as well that a man should have thought out the meaning of the important words in his vocabulary; and this is unfortunately by no means a universal rule. But how much clearer Mr. Davies would have been to his readers if, instead of speculating, or refusing to speculate, on the Saviour's 'struggle out of individual self-consciousness up to divine universal self-identity', or His determination to be a 'god incognito', he had called us to contemplate Christ as the Son of God, coming to us that He might share with us that Sonship, and building all who came to Him for that gift into a community whose very life consists in sharing with Him, and with one another, all that God Himself has to give.

WILLIAM F. LOFTHOUSE

Editorial Comments

A NEW CHAPTER IN GREEK HISTORY

It has often been taken for granted that Greek history ended with the coming of Philip of Macedon. Many a book has been labelled 'A History of Greece' and its author, scorning a sub-title, has ended his last section with the events of 338 B.C. as though there was no more to be said!

In this dramatic hour, when the Greek resistance to the Italian invader has thrilled and astonished the world, one is suddenly conscious of an amazing gap. We remember reading something of the far-off beginnings of this ancient people. With minds awakened did they not defy the threats of Persian and Carthagian Empires? In the very process they developed a national unity which guaranteed survival. We remember, too, those glorious years when their political and intellectual activity reached its height, when poetry and history and art were on the grand scale and even the Peloponnesian War became, in spite of its tragedy, majestic. Though poetry presently gave way to prose we were reminded that the great intellect was ripening. Then suddenly we began to see signs of decay; the power of the city-state declined and—almost before we knew it—the chapter had ended and, with it, our knowledge of the history of Greece!

Even a standard work on 'The Dark Ages', written by one of our greatest historians, has not the name 'Greece' in its index. The centuries roll on, and Europe, owing so much of what is best in her life to Hellenic civilization, seemed to have forgotten the existence of the Greek people. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the menace of Napoleonic ambition was no sooner ended than a reactionary spirit proceeded to attempt to restore the pre-Revolutionary world. Spain and Italy were cowed by Metternich and his colleagues when, suddenly, a little country, whose very name had fallen into oblivion, asserted its right to liberty and self-government. Europe was astonished, and ultimately pleased, at the renascence of Greece. The spirit of Marathon and Thermopylae seemed to have returned. The peoples of Europe were sympathetic, though the politicians hesitated. Enthusiastic volunteers joined the Greek forces, and in Edinburgh, on August 21, 1822, the first meeting was held to raise funds to aid them. Five months later Andreas Luriotis arrived in England to advocate the cause of Greek independence, and the historic Greek Committee was formed. Meanwhile Lord Byron had placed himself and his fortune at the service of the Greeks. He came to them prepared to raise and equip a company of Suliotes, and to lead them, in person, in their struggle for freedom. The first two years of fighting had resulted in brilliant Greek



successes, but they were followed by a period of disagreement amongst their leaders. There is a passage in a statesmanlike letter written by Lord Byron to the General Government of Greece on November 30, 1823. After stressing the importance of preserving their unity if they expected to receive assistance from abroad, he wrote: 'The rest, gentlemen, depends on you. You have fought gloriously;—act honourably towards your fellow-citizens and the world, and it will then no more be said, as has been repeated for two thousand years with the Roman historians, that Philopoemon was the last of the Grecians.' From people who were bondsmen, and whose ancestors for five hundred years had been bondsmen, he demanded united action. Let them have a fair field on which to win their independence, and he believed they would shape their future to the splendid proportions of their past. It seemed a lot to ask, but that was a century ago. A hundred years has made a vast difference to their character as a nation. In the Balkan cockpit they have played many parts, but gradually they have emerged, as a dauntless people, in whose hearts the love of freedom has been unquenched.

The epic struggle which is being fought out in the Albanian hills is showing us the courage of the Evzones matching the courage of Sparta and of Athens. Whatever may be the ultimate issue, such valiant deeds have already been done that a man might well be proud to say, simply, 'I am a Greek!'

The new books that purport to be 'A History of Greece' will not end with the circumstances of 338 B.C. A new chapter is being written now. Maybe it will prove the most glorious of all.

* * * * *

It would be unspeakable tragedy if the rise of Greece should mean a new decline and fall of Italy. There are many things which suggest that the Italian people may yet see the folly of the policy of those who, at this moment, claim to lead them. As one contemplates the hideous outcome of the Italian 'adventure' in Albania one recalls a lecture on 'The Problem of the Near East' delivered by G. P. Gooch at Cambridge in 1902. It contained this significant passage: 'Those who recommend the occupation of Albania are no friends of Italy; to conquer and to hold that mountainous and barren country, in which, as it has been said, a large army starves and a small one is defeated, would almost certainly prove beyond her strength, and might involve a recurrence of the disasters of Abyssinia.' These words, spoken thirty-eight years ago, are strangely true to-day. Yet there is a future which Greek and Italian might help to shape, when the madness of dictatorship has passed.

* * * * *

At the beginning of this century, Italy seemed cast to play a great role. Her new spirit, quickened by the work of three great men—Cavour the statesman, Garibaldi the guerrilla leader, and Mazzini the

prophet—had grown strong, not because of armies but because of ideals. It has been said that, in the mid-years of the nineteenth century, Mazzini 'lifted the politics of Italy to the height of a religious faith, and stamped them with his own moral grandeur'. Intense nationalist as he was, he believed in the first claim of the larger humanity. Communities held together by natural ties were, he maintained, the best groups to work for the good of the world. 'Nationality', he said, 'is sacred to me, because I see in it the instrument of labour for the good and progress of all men.' For him the idea of nationality involved the idea of a people conscious of their tremendous obligation to serve the world.

The new Italy he helped to shape was increasingly noteworthy for its national altruism. The doctrine of slave populations and military monopoly can never keep such an ideal in permanent subjection.

THE MAN OF MUNICH

It is too soon to assess the value of Mr. Chamberlain's services to his country and to humanity. As the Prime Minister said, in paying his tribute: 'The fierce and bitter controversies which hung around him in recent times were hushed by the news of his illness and are silenced by his death.' It is not for us, however, to draw a curtain about his memory as though, in charity, we would hide some dishonourable fact. Whatever history may say about 'Munich', it is clear, even now, that the man who faced the dictators in that fateful hour faced them with dignity, with courage, and with the utmost sincerity. He fought for the peace of the world. If he failed to win it, at least he made clear to posterity that the British people were eager to avert war and, what is equally important, determined to preserve freedom and justice as the undoubted birthright of all men. Those who with superficial evidence denounced his policy in fierce tirades, have never publicly reviewed their verdicts in the light of the subsequent tragedy of France. How far could French aid have been relied upon in the first crisis? No one can answer the question now, but it is obvious that the subsequent political and military debacle in France suggests that Britain, unprepared, might have had to stand alone then. These questions of safety or expediency, however, were not the concern which weighed most heavily with Neville Chamberlain. In the last conversation which Lord Halifax had with him, only two days before he died, he talked quite simply and intimately about kindly, sympathetic letters he had been receiving. He had been especially touched by those who had written expressing gratitude for his example. 'That', he said, 'is something I cannot understand, because I am not conscious of having set one. All I have done is to try and do what I thought right.'

Whatever may have been his faults, those most closely associated with him have borne their testimony to his singleness of purpose and his simplicity of conduct. Posterity may reverse or moderate the

critical judgement of many on the Munich Settlement in the light of the actual situation at that moment.

There is an account of the last words of William Pitt which provides one with an interesting reflection on the passing of Neville Chamberlain. In a printed monograph by the Earl of Stanhope the sentence is recorded: 'Oh, my country, how I love my country!' The later discovery of a blurred manuscript makes it seem probable that the sentence should have read: 'Oh, my country, how I *leave* my country!' Like his father, the Earl of Chatham, Pitt had unbounded confidence in himself as the only deliverer of his land. His last thoughts, as he lay dying in 1806 in the midst of the Napoleonic War, were overcast with gloom. How could England live if he died!

One can hardly imagine Neville Chamberlain feeling like that. His confidence lay in the righteousness of the cause, rather than in the unique qualities of the man. Shy and selflessly patriotic, he did not hesitate to hand over his high office and to serve in a subordinate capacity. Though peace had not been established, he died with no thought of gloom, no slightest question of defeat. He did not for a moment believe that Britain was doomed because he was dying. He was big enough to look at his own death as a minor happening, because he had seen the vision of a world at peace, and believed its realization was inevitable. Whatever he could do to further this he strove to do, according to his light, but that right could fail to triumph was, to him, unthinkable. There could be no doubt as to the word Chamberlain would have chosen had he used Pitt's sentence, 'Oh, my country, how I love my country!' The 'Man of Munich' had done much for our land before he faced the dictators. As Minister of Health his work will be remembered and reckoned as of major importance in the development of Poor Law and as a lasting contribution to the well-being of the people.

He loved his country, and he loved righteousness still more. He passed on, confident that right would conquer wrong, and happy that he had striven for what he believed to be right. There is no gloom in such a passing.

DEEP SEA HEAVEN

To spend one's life sailing rough seas and healing the grim wounds of poverty-stricken fishermen may seem a strange idea of heaven, yet to Grenfell of Labrador it was little less. He has passed from us, and his passing was hidden by the clouds of war, but he has left us a great legacy. Quite unconsciously he gave us example and precept which might stand us in good stead as we face life in a world that has become as black as the coasts of Labrador.

In his ingenuous writings there are passages which challenge and inspire. They might well be gathered together under some such title as 'The Splendour of a Bleak Coast', for he tells us of rocks that were

havens, and simple hearts about which hovered the Shechinah—the glory of the presence of God.

'Obviously the coast offered us work that would not be done unless we did it,' he said, and revealed the *lure* of Labrador-like coasts to any of God's adventurers. In such a mood David Livingstone wrote to his sister of his proposed journey to a fever-stricken zone: 'Fever may cast us all off. I feel much when I think of the children dying. But who will go if we don't?' There is no gainsaying such men.

Nor do they suffer our congratulations! They have found the *joy* of the 'bleak coast'. 'I have always believed the Good Samaritan went across the road just because he wanted to,' said Grenfell. 'I do not believe that he felt any sacrifice or fear in the matter.'

But a man cannot be content with half measures on rough seas or rock-bound territories. 'Whatever they did, they did hard,' he says of the North Sea fishermen, and immediately showed them that his own sense of service was to the utmost. 'The tough jobs are the very ones which appeal to real men. . . . Therein lies the true secret of Christianity.'

Yet one doubts whether a man of limited vision could discover such things or respond as he did unless he had found a far-off interest beyond the rock-bound fortress of man's earthly existence. 'The biggest problem of human life—the belief that man is not of the earth, but only a temporary sojourner upon it. This belief, that he is destined to go on living elsewhere, makes a vast difference to one's estimate of values. Life becomes a school instead of a mere stage. . . .' Once a man has realized this he finds beyond the lure, and the joy, a *purpose* in the very blackness.

And with all the fickleness of wind and wave he may find *certainities* in an uncertain life. 'For though time has rounded off the corners of my conceit, experience of God's dealing with such an unworthy midget as myself has so strengthened the foundations on which faith stood, that Christ now means more to me as a living Presence than when I laid more emphasis on the dogmas concerning Him.'

That was the spirit of the man who conquered Labrador. For us in this bleak world there is the same joy and certainty, for we, too, are scholars in a hard school, yet with the same great purpose set before us.

DEATH OF AN ARTIST

That is a strange phrase to use of Eric Gill, master craftsman, dreamer and doer—a man who looked for eternity through the gap that some call death. Few men have done more than he to preserve the rights and the necessity of craftsmanship in this machine age with its remorseless schemes of mass production and its threatened standardization of life. To him the alleged miracles of scientific and mechanized industrialism were 'no more than the feats of highly intellectual animals, and the more we perfect our mechanization the more nearly do we approach the organized life of bees and ants'. But the man who

gave us the beauty of the Gill Sans type gave us a new quality in 'print' because to him the task was holy, a creative effort which 'ministered truth'—to use one of his own phrases. Not only did he help us to the better printing of our books, but he has left us, in his autobiography, a fine book. He was essentially an artist. Some of his sculpture may endure, but if bombs destroy it we shall still have the pattern of his type and what is more important, the pattern of his faith whence his ideals sprang to life. 'What I hope above all things', he says, 'is that I have done something towards reintegrating bed and board, the small farm and the workshop, the home and the school, earth and heaven.' His creative faculties were never idle; the world is richer, materially, for his effort, but he gave, without stint, rarer wealth than could be caught in stone or bronze—the flowering of a beautiful mind, and the findings of a questing spirit.

At the gateway of eternity, he paused ere he passed through, and wrote his final message: 'If you don't believe in God there ain't no "ought"', and then any exceptionally strong and cunning person has as much "right" to rob and rape as anyone else has to stop him. . . . That seems to me to make nonsense of the universe and everything in it, and most of all it makes nonsense of man's life and all his doings. But the alternative is stupendous, stupendous and terrifying. For the alternative is the Cross. The Cross is the meaning of the Universe.'

When one looks again at his poignant picture of 'The Blind Give' one will remember and see, perhaps, life's meaning beyond the darkness.

LESLIE F. CHURCH

Ministers in Council

Matters galore now present themselves for discussion by ministers in council.

* * * * *

SUNDAY CINEMAS: A NEW POWER. Under an Order dated December 20, 1939, a new Regulation (42 B) was added to the Defence (General) Regulations. This was officially summarized as relating to 'Opening on Sundays of cinemas in areas in England or Wales where Forces are quartered'. According to the actual text of the regulation, the circumstance in mind was to be 'that large numbers of members of His Majesty's Forces are quartered in, or in the neighbourhood of, a particular area'. Given that fact, certain action might be taken by the competent naval, military, or air force authority. This power was not conferred upon any officer, by and large. Specifically, the one and only authority recognized by the regulations was defined as an officer authorized by the Admiralty, the Army Council or the Air Council for this purpose. This point is here named as it has been found to be of practical moment. If, then, such an officer, duly authorized, in view of the gathering of 'large' forces, held the opinion that it was expedient for licensed cinemas to be opened on Sundays for the purpose of cinematograph entertainments, he was given by the regulation the opportunity of furnishing to the local Council a certificate stating that opinion.

What the local Council might then do was left to its option. On the one hand, it could proceed to apply to the Secretary of State for permission to open cinemas on Sundays. Under the regulation quoted, this permission could be given without the necessity of a Town's Meeting and a Poll, as had previously been the statutory procedure in peace time under the Sunday Entertainment Act 1932. But equally, on the other hand, the local Council might decide against such Sunday opening. This was made clear in a Home Office circular, No. 830,114, dated December 30, 1939, sent by the Under Secretary of State for Home Affairs to the Clerks of all Councils. This circular distinctly stated: 'The receipt of a certificate from the competent naval, military, or air force authority does not impose any obligation on the Council of the borough or county district to which it is sent. . . . It will rest with the Council to determine whether the necessary steps to obtain an order should be taken.' Before coming to a decision, local Councils were to advertise the matter and then to consider any representations made to them by opponents of Sunday opening.

A FRESH PROBLEM was thus created for all civic leaders and Christian citizens. All were intensely anxious to strain every nerve in the interests of the men in the forces. Already in most areas, canteens, rest rooms, and other forms of hospitality had been provided. What then of this new proposal? Now the regulation allowing Sunday opening showed concern for Service men only, and had the multitudinous applications been in respect of them alone, the situation might have been easier. Actually, however, the permission sought up and down the land was for all and sundry, civilians as well as soldiers, men, women, and children. The question therefore arising has been: Is it in the best all-round interests of the community to open the doors of the cinemas seven days a week and to let all who please crowd into these places of amusement on Sundays? It was significant that some of the earliest answers in the negative came, not on religious grounds from members of the churches, but from Labour leaders. Many thoughtful folk, after serious reflection, also felt that the present tendency to make all seven days of the week alike is a serious menace to the healthy life of society and that the need of differentiating one day from the other six is of deep social, physical, and psychological importance.

Furthermore, it was discovered in actual practice that where Sunday cinemas were allowed ostensibly for soldiers, the majority of those attending were civilians. Thus, in Nottingham, the local papers reported that on Sunday opening coming into force, in one of the leading cinemas, out of 1,700 present, only 50 were men of the forces. In a southern town, a newspaper published photographs showing the very large queues assembled and in these Service men were conspicuous by their absence.

Other factors also entered into consideration. Thus, Sunday films mean extra work for cinema employees and there has been reason to believe that it is not easy to enforce for them a stipulation securing one day's rest in seven. Again, whereas the power under the special Regulation, for Sunday opening, was granted only for the war-time period, the conviction had been freely expressed in interested quarters that a public taste would be developed that would prevent any relinquishment when peace was restored. The fear that financial motives loomed large received confirmation when in a London daily a signed article appeared, headed 'Sunday films in all towns "Or we close"—Owners'. Besides, whilst local Councils have, under the Sunday Entertainment Act, the right to make a levy on profits of 'either the whole or such proportion of them, as the licensing authority may think fit', yet, when in exercise of this power, Councils stipulated what to them and other impartial opinion seemed a reasonable levy, they have, in certain cases, been met by a refusal to open on those terms. Many citizens also have held the view that provision for the welfare of Service men is a duty resting essentially on the community and not to be lightly passed on to a commercial concern. And it has been widely

felt that whilst soldiers themselves might wish to make some financial return for entertainment given, yet it should be the pleasure of the community to eschew profit-making at the expense of the men of the forces.

* * * * *

A NEW APPROACH is therefore being sought to the problems thus raised. A number of Councils have turned down the proposals for Sunday opening. Others, as is well known, have agreed to it. But, in either case, it is being realized that the satisfaction of the needs underlying the project lies on a different plane. Contacts have to be made on a non-commercial basis. Fireside hospitality must be organized on a larger scale. As churches, we have to learn our way in fuller measure to the heart of the man in the king's uniform and to discover how best to serve those set for our defence. Gallant and self-sacrificing labours in various directions in different localities are pointing the better way.

* * * * *

'WHY SUNDAY?' is, however, another query emerging that has to gain a clearer answer, if the thoughts of our congregations are to be prepared for the reconstruction of religious life, as well as of civilian society, that confronts us. For years past it is to be feared that the rich spiritual significance of the Lord's Day has been a fading, waning conception for many even of our church members. For years there has been a steady secularizing of Sunday in social life. War time will engender habits that will make the task of the Christian Church all the more onerous. Yet it is a tonic to pursue the line of thought which is sketched by the Rev. E. G. Loosley, B.D., in that interesting chapter in his book *When the Church was very Young* (Allen & Unwin) which deals with the gloriously successful evangelical work of the Early Church, when there was no Sabbath-observance among the masses to help them. Though the world's business went forward among the Gentiles on the Lord's Day, just as on other days, yet the Christian Church maintained its witness and gained converts and created finally the hunger for a complete day of rest and worship. The social as well as the textual setting of this rehabilitation of the day are illumined by Dr. R. H. Charles in *The Decalogue* (T. & T. Clark) and by the Rev. J. H. Flowers in *The Permanent Value of the Ten Commandments* (Allen & Unwin), both of whom deal with the relationship between the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sunday. The Methodist Declaration on the Christian Observance of Sunday is of value and might with advantage be used in classes of young people.

* * * * *

POPULAR THEOLOGY. Those bent on discerning the signs of the times must be struck by the indications from many quarters of a renewed sharp interest by the public in theology. Dr. J. S. Whale by his broadcast talks on *The Christian Faith* caught the ear of the listener

at home. Recently he has been giving a course of lectures at Cambridge on Christian Doctrine that have attracted remarkable crowds. Dons and undergraduates to the number of at least five hundred have been packed into the lecture room. To other audiences Miss Dorothy L. Sayers, as an enthusiastic student, has followed up her earlier ventures into the theological realm by the printing of an address given to Church Tutorial workers under the title of *Creed or Chaos* (Hodder & Stoughton, 6d.). Now comes the issue in cheap form of a series of theological booklets named 'Signposts' (Dacre Press, 1s.) designed to deal with the relevance of the Christian faith to the contemporary crisis of civilization. The authors are stated to be young philosophers and theologians of the Church of England. One of the editors, J. V. L. Casserley, was brought up under Rationalist influence and was first interested in theology by reading an attack upon Christianity. He studied at the London School of Economics and at King's College, London. The other editor is E. L. Mascall, a former scholar of Pembroke College, Cambridge, where he studied mathematics and became a Wrangler in 1927. Six other contributors make up the team of writers responsible for a dozen small books. The subjects dealt with include *The Fate of Modern Culture*; *God, the Living and the True*; *Man, his Origin and Destiny*; *The Resurrection of the Bible*; *The God-Man*; *The Re-creation of Man*; *The Church of God*; *Providence and History*. Each booklet is, in the main, written in easy, familiar style, has marked concern for social reform, and represents a strong swing-over to the traditional outlook on Scripture and to the historic creeds. A useful feature is the citation of further literature for more serious study.

These and other attempts to give a reasoned and popular statement of theological convictions to the modern mind emphasize the words of Dr. Vincent Taylor in his Fernley-Hartley Lecture on *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching*: 'A more virile and positive theology is one of the greatest needs of the Church to-day . . . Unless our apprehension and statement of Christian doctrine can regain life and vigour, the ministry of the Church, so vitally needed by the world to-day, is likely to remain in eclipse for at least a generation.'

* * * * *

I shall be glad to receive reports and also comments on any subject for these columns.

W. E. FARNDALÉ

10 Mainwaring Road,
Lincoln

Recent Literature

The Development of Religious Toleration in England. By W. K. Jordan, PH.D. (Allen & Unwin. 21s. net.)

This work brings to completion Dr. Jordan's researches into the growth of toleration which he has traced from the beginning of the Reformation to the Restoration of the Monarchy. He is chiefly concerned in this volume with a review of the various types of lay thought which found remarkable and varied expression during a momentous period. Not that Anglican and Roman Catholic thought is ignored; for he adds a survey of the opinions of Anglican extremists and moderates, the chief of whom is Jeremy Taylor, as well as of Roman thought, clerical and lay, of the period under consideration, 1640-69. But the interest of his readers will be drawn rather to his careful and valuable account of the Latitudinarians, the Cambridge Platonists, the Rationalists and Sceptics, the Erastians and what he terms the Inarticulate thought of the rank and file. We look back to-day to that revolutionary period as the era in which the foundations of civil and religious liberty were laid and the right of private judgement in matters of religion was secured to the individual layman without fear of persecution and clerical repression.

It is a fascinating study, therefore, to consider the very varied points of view which the age produced, involving as it does an immense range of names, some famous like Milton, Hobbes, and Harrington, Cowley and Francis Osborne, together with the Cambridge Platonists, who were less concerned with the institutional religion than with the ideas which it formulates for the wellbeing of mankind. We pass from Peter Sterry, who was a Cambridge Platonist, but also an individualist, gifted with a mystic and poetic sensibility, to a cold rationalist like Francis Osborne, contemptuous of orthodox religion and opposed to persecution on the ground that sects, like the Arminian, flourished under it. At another extreme we have the curious heterodoxy of Elizabeth Avery the Quakeress, without belief in immortality, except in the sense that she would be merged in the general being of God, and the 'blasphemy' of Richard Coppin, who was bound over at Worcester for holding that Christ was a man, that heaven and hell are imaginary, and that all men will be saved.

The author, writing in August 1939, claimed that religious liberty stands as a symbol 'for ideals of freedom, justice, and decency of human relationships which as these lines are written, appear to be under formidable and ruthless attack'. The attack still continues and readers of this able and scholarly study of the theory of religious toleration which was established in 1660 and is now rooted in the Empire, will be

inspired by the sense of a great and precious inheritance to be defended at all costs against a debased Caesarism, which flouts the ideals not only of justice, liberty, and the decencies of human relationships, but of the very Christian religion itself.

R. MARTIN POPE

Psychology, Psychotherapy and Evangelicalism. By J. G. McKenzie, D.D. (Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.)

There are so many books on psychology and psychotherapy nowadays that one might well demur at anyone using the scanty paper of wartime in writing another. But the third, and rather ugly word, of Professor McKenzie's title indicates where his book makes a contribution, and a useful one. It is the most theologically psychological, or, if you like, the most psychologically theological book I have come across. The theologians, as a whole, are still suspicious of psychology. Lately some of them have been casting envious glances across the hedge between theology and psychology as if uncertain whether to ask for an introduction to the newcomer. Professor McKenzie, if he doesn't exactly knock the fence down, certainly offers the introduction. For that, one is duly grateful. The doctrine of salvation is that which is most under consideration in these pages. Reading the discussion of the various types of theories of Atonement, with the illuminating comments which Professor McKenzie often makes upon them, one is struck again with the fact that Jesus found the forgiveness of sins a much more simple matter than theology has found it. To Him it was connected with man's attitude much more often than with God's, and the oft-repeated connection between man forgiving and being forgiven never seems to have much weight attached to it by theology.

In most respects one agrees with Professor McKenzie, but in one, at least, that agreement breaks. He speaks of 'the false notion that the root and centre of personal religious experience lies in mystical states of consciousness'. Granted that there are many who profess, nay who possess, religion without them, but still that is not a *personal*, but rather an *impersonal*, religious experience. It is an experience of religion, not to experience religion. To speak of a 'fellowship' with God which is objective and external is to misuse the word fellowship. One might as well speak of being in love without emotion. Let us grant that there are many ways of apprehending God. None would deny, shall we say, that Spinoza was a man of deeply religious spirit, but there is nothing to suggest that he had a personal religious experience. A man may have experience of personal religious convictions about God, but a religious experience is an experience of God, and that comes only, as Plotinus found, from mystical experience. One need not be a mystic in the accepted sense of the term to share in that experience, but it still remains that no man knows God personally who has not felt as well as thought God.

E. S. WATERHOUSE

The Social Function of Religion. By E. O. James, D.LITT., PH.D.
(University of London Press. Hodder & Stoughton Ltd. 7s. 6d.)

This book possesses the merit of a well-informed and scholarly background but one which covers such a wide area (it takes up almost two-thirds of the book) that it tends to fray out at the edges. At certain points it is a somewhat tenuous thread that links the problem with the argument. This occasional sense of slender connection between background and problem is due, in our opinion, to what appears to be an unwise choice of title. It is more the place or influence of religion in primitive and later society rather than the social function of religion that covers the larger part of the book. And although Dr. James does make clear, within the scope of his own treatment of the subject, what the social function of religion involves, he makes out no specific case as to what the social function of religion is or ought to be in practical application. We fear that the reader will be disappointed in the book, not because it is without worth, but because the title will lead him to expect something different from what the book contains. Nor can we escape the impression that the book appears to be made up of one-time independent subjects which, while the author succeeds in making them relate, do not always suggest a vital coherence. Possibly this impression is gained because, in a subject of this sort, while the way of life of primitive man may be cited, it is not very usual to make an anthropological investigation. But Professor James believes in 'the methods and principles of anthropological investigation', a field in which he has done much important work and about which he has written freely. But even he has to admit that only the place of religion in society can be laid bare by such investigation. And this side of the work, in our judgement, takes up too much of the book.

Making the claim that in the past religion has been the 'unifying and consolidating' principle of society and that 'man is not the architect of human destiny', the author argues that there must be something deeper in society than politics, or ethics, or convenient philosophies and, because Christianity means the revelation of God in history, the first requirement is that God shall become the centre of human affairs. To gain this end is the function of religion. And it may be said that if, on occasion, there is repeated what has been said before, there are also many passages that are fresh, penetrating, and virile. Chapters on The Church and the Community and The Nation and Nationalism, which include an analysis of and a judgement on Marxian materialism, Fascism, National Socialism, the Turkish nationalist movement and the nationalism of Spain, are excellently done. It may also be added that the chapters covering Dr. James's anthropological investigation are not without interest.

T. W. BEVAN

Handbook to the Cambridgeshire Syllabus of Religious Teaching. By Basil A. Yeaxlee, PH.D. (S.C.M. Press. 4s. 6d. net.)

It is now generally recognized that the adequate equipment of teachers who have to give instruction in religion in our public elementary and secondary schools is of vital importance. It is not enough to have a syllabus, admirably suggestive though it may be. One of the best of these, the *Cambridgeshire Syllabus*, is simply a guide and does not provide a hard and fast scheme of lessons. Hence the necessity of a Handbook such as is provided by Dr. Basil Yeaxlee. It is graduated in two main sections, covering the ages of 11+ to 14+. It opens with St. Mark and Acts i-iv, followed by the Old Testament up to the Exile, an admirable beginning in the right order, leading on the more advanced teaching relating to the Old and New Covenants and the history and universal mission of Christianity. At each stage the teacher is provided with helpful suggestions and references to appropriate literature.

We can heartily recommend this book, which is worthy of its author's high reputation and excellently adapted for its purpose. It is the offspring of a real sympathy with the teacher who needs candour, courage, and judgement when confronted by the difficult questions and problems of the miraculous and other aspects of the text which modern criticism has raised. From this point of view we could wish that lay preachers and Sunday school teachers might avail themselves of the benefit to be gained from the pages of this manual.

R. MARTIN POPE

Ex Libris. By E. E. Kellett. (Allen & Unwin. 8s. 6d.)

This book is a well-annotated library catalogue. It chronicles in varying detail the books of youth, age, scholarship, and interest. Interwoven with the lists and estimates of books is an autobiography of the librarian himself. To have read constantly (as this writer has done) in so many branches of literature is a fine achievement, but to have digested the contents of the books read (as Mr. Kellett has also done) is remarkable. The result is an eminently readable volume which defies the ordinary methods of review. Herein is reflected that easy grace and spacious vista of the Victorian age in literature. The book stirs our memories of childhood days—of Sunday School prizes and the early acquaintance with the classics which start the education of man. Many of the books noted have long since gone out of fashion, but their value for a former age is recorded. For the lighter moments of a student's life these literary details will have much interest and to the majority of educated folk will be attractive because of the style of the author.

Nehru: The Rising Star of India. By Anup Singh. (Allen & Unwin. Cloth 5s. Paper boards 3s. 6d.)

The name of Nehru is well known to newspaper readers in this country, but to most it is only a name. Mr. Singh gives us a clear and sympathetic account of the complex personality behind the name. Nehru, 51 years of age, comes from a prosperous Brahmin stock. He was trained at Harrow and Cambridge. In his youth he leaned to theosophy. Now he is a Marxian Socialist and agnostic. Yet he remains an ardent follower of Gandhi, though drifting further and further from his master's ideals. He is a thorn in the flesh of the British raj, but a bitter opponent of Fascism, and his claim for the complete independence of India, as he well knows, would, if now fulfilled, leave India an easy prey for the Axis. Even to Nehru one would think it seems inconsistent for the Indian lamb to demand the withdrawal of the British shepherds when the wolves are outside the fold. Dr. Singh interests us in his subject, but, judging from what we read here, the problem of India might be simply that of the British Government and educated Hindus. There is no reference to the Muhammadan side of the question, and little to the fact that about a fifth of the population are under the rule of the rajahs. Dr. Singh is fond of saying 'India thinks', 'India says', and so forth, but the truth is that India is hopelessly divided, and until Hindu and Muhammadan, the Congress party and the rajahs can be brought to some semblance of agreement, there will be little chance of anything that the British Government can do will set India on the road to fulfil her own destiny.

Studies in the Relationship between Islam and Christianity: Psychological and Historical. By Loofty Levonian. (Allen & Unwin. 6s.)

Mr. Levonian, Dean of the Near East School of Theology, Beirut, makes, in this modest little book, a contribution of no little interest to his subject. He lays great stress upon the fact that for the Semitic races, whether the Jews of the Old Testament days, or modern Muslim peoples, spirit belongs essentially to the material realm, whereas for ourselves it is regarded as definitely the opposite of matter. For them man was a body animate, for us he is a soul incarnate. Mr. Levonian traces out many consequences of this primary distinction, consequences which have much bearing on the relationship between Islam and Christianity. For example, the Muslim interprets the term Son of God in a physical sense and finds it repugnant. He argues that all creation is material, and spirit is created, but God is immaterial and must therefore be unlike all His creation. A medical missionary amongst the 'fundamentalist' sect of Islam, the Wahabbis, gave great offence by putting on his cart the words God is a Spirit. To the Wahabbis this meant that God was a created being. This unshakable idea of the utter difference between God and man has many consequences. For example, it forbids

attributing moral attributes to God. He is above all such. What He does is never to be questioned. True the Quran speaks of God as the Compassionate and Merciful, but there is no analogy between these epithets and the human qualities of the same name. The orthodox attributes of God are Life, Knowledge, Power, Will, Hearing, Sight, and Speech, none of which has any moral significance. Mr. Levonian does not work all this out with the idea of condemning Islam, but simply to make it clear that Islam and Christianity cannot understand each other until this fundamental difference is appreciated and settled. The latter part of the book deals with the historical relations between Islam and Christianity, and closes with some valuable reflections upon the present situation. The idea that Islam is unchanging is false. It is changing rapidly at the present moment. Turkey and Egypt afford the most striking, but by no means the only, proof. Christianity has a great opportunity to-day in Islamic countries. The Quran itself includes the followers of Jesus amongst the true Muslims. Christianity can fulfil rather than destroy Islam. It is to this end that Mr. Levonian contributes this psychological study of the difference between the mentality of the two faiths. What has been said will be enough to indicate the interest this book has for all those who are concerned with the relationship between the two religions, and one can say without any hesitation that the book is an honest and successful attempt to aid in a problem which is more than a missionary problem, which has bearings on the whole world situation and the development of mankind.

E. S. W.

A Saviour in Sight. By Leonard C. Horwood. (Epworth Press. 4s.)

For years there has been needed a book of strong conviction and clear teaching on the challenge that Jesus makes to the thoughtful youth of our time. Such a volume had to avoid the inanities of much that passes for evangelism and the abstruse arguments of the older Theology.

This book has been written by Rev. Leonard C. Horwood of New Zealand. It is worthy of its theme and serves both the present and the coming age with remarkable skill.

The author introduces his subject by a consideration of the Hidden Deity. God is lost in the shadows of our narrow definitions, but may be found in Christ. Mr. Horwood then reveals a vision of God in Christ, which satisfies the facts of our life and His, but the vision is blurred by sin, suffering, and the state of modern society, and with these problems and their only solution the author deals fearlessly and effectively. The issue of such a vision and the solving of such difficulties brings a faith that unifies our personality, makes peace and joy, and is broad based on and fully realized in Christ.

This book meets a real need with a sanctity and zest that is thoroughly satisfying. It ought to be in the hands of Preachers and Leaders, as well as those of the members of our Churches and Congregations.

The Church and the World. Vol. 3. *Church and Society in England from 1800.* Maurice B. Reckitt. (George Allen. 7s. 6d.)

How are ordinary men and women, busy about earning a livelihood and concerned about home and family, to gain an intelligent understanding of the forces, disruptive and creative, now at work in the world? They ask: How did the present state of affairs come about? What has the Church done about it? What is it doing? Ought the Church to be 'other-worldly', or to enter actively into the solution of national and international social problems? How has it happened that in spite of many centuries of Christian teaching, there seems to be a renaissance of paganism, a return to jungle-law? To answer these and other allied questions requires an amount of leisure for intensive study and thought which for Mr. Everyman is not available. Yet he feels that adequately to prepare himself for the new world now coming painfully to birth he ought to know his way about this, to him, uncharted country of sociological theory and practice, and the relation to it of the primary articles of the Christian Faith. So he asks for a guide able to indicate the main track clearly, with pointers to the bypaths converging upon it.

Such a guide we feel is to be found in the pages of Mr. Reckitt's volume. He seeks to bring out the truth about the past, and to indicate the problems which consideration of that truth raises for all who are thinking about the sociological issues of the contemporary situation. His method makes the reader feel that he is being led skilfully through the maze of conflicting theory and practice of the past 140 years. He is made familiar with the leading figures and the considered judgements of succeeding thinkers on their work. The slow awakening of the Christian social conscience is made clear with the reasons for it, and the reader is helped to understand how the failure to Christianize commerce, politics, and social theory and practice culminated in the catastrophe of 1939. No mean achievement for a small book of 250 pages!

To summarize so closely knit a conspectus as this is not easy. Only the general outline can be indicated, leaving the reader himself to explore the wealth of detail. After briefly summarizing the state of society and religion in the early nineteenth century, and showing how the religious influences of the time, whether orthodox or revivalist, were completely devoid of the prophetic spirit by which the significance of the social transition could be interpreted, and of any true understanding of human society as intended to be the scene of a divine order, Mr. Reckitt outlines reform movements in the social and ecclesiastical spheres. In the second chapter the rise of democratic feeling, the Reform Act, Benthamism, and Owenism are dealt with; in the third, the work of the Broad Churchmen, the Ecclesiastical Reformers, the High Churchmen and the Oxford Movement. 'At the moment of political agitation, social distress, religious alienation and ecclesiastical

controversy, a new prophetic voice was raised within the Church of England—that of F. D. Maurice. His work and influence are delineated in chapter four, together with the writings of three men 'utterly different in spirit', yet with a common demand, the recognition of a new social outlook—Engels, Disraeli, and W. G. Ward. Chapter five opens with a brief outline of the Communist Manifesto of 1847 and passes to the genesis of 'Christian Socialism', associated with the names of men like Ludlow, Hughes, and Neale. Maurice's energy, says Mr. Reckitt, went into 'socializing Christianity, and the others into Christianizing socialism'.

Twenty-five years had to pass for any further attempt at an organized social movement. A chapter on 'The Victorian Watershed' dealing with the period 1850-75 precedes a discussion of the developments during the last quarter of the century, during which rose the Guild of St. Matthew, associated with Headlam, and the Christian Social Union dominated by Westcott, Gore, and Holland. Thus, under the pressure of differing groups, there slowly emerged in the Church of England a social conscience.

The first decade of the twentieth century saw society going 'forward more confidently than ever in fulfilment of a progressive destiny universally hypothecated', but 'after 1910 there was a check to the rise in the standard of living, social philosophies came up for revision, and Continental problems threatened danger'. The C.S.U.'s influence was passing from prophecy to practical reform, and among the Nonconformists inspired the formation of social service unions. The Christian Socialist League came into being. Just when 'the tide of optimistic progressivism had already turned and men were exploring possibilities of social change, the catastrophe of war fell on them'.

The last chapter, 'Twixt War and War', deals with landmarks and tendencies; changes in the reform agencies, culminating in C.O.P.E.C. and in oecumenical conferences at Stockholm and Oxford. This is followed by an epilogue on 'The Contemporary Situation and its Problems', and two valuable appendices on: 'The Church and the World in the Mission Field since 1802', by F. W. T. Craske, and on: 'The Church and the Education of the People after 1833', by C. K. Francis Brown.

As already said, to summarize so closely knit a conspectus is difficult, but we hope sufficient of the book's content has been indicated to suggest that the inquiring mind may here find some of its questions answered, and help given towards the formation of a true perspective within which to place the urgent problems now exercising the minds of all anxious to help in the creation of a new social order. Mr. Reckitt lays his readers under an obligation for his painstaking guidance, and we wish for his book the wide circulation it deserves.

J. E. UNDERWOOD

Faith in Dark Ages. By F. R. Barry. (S.C.M. Press. 2s. 6d.)

Canon Barry points out that we stand at the cross-roads of a warring world and a warring soul, and shows that as we rely on a fundamental Christian faith in God we shall find the only way out of our perplexities. He writes of the defence of Christianity, Christians and compromise, faith in dark ages, and of God in history. The victory of Christendom is not won on the defensive but in the attack. On the matter of compromise Canon Barry says many pertinent things. He realizes we live in an imperfect world and the fact that the Christian cannot have all his demands does not allow him to stand aloof from its affairs. The progress to the ideal is being made though we may not be able to gain the absolute, since we ourselves are sinful and live in a sinful world. The chapter on prayer and its answers in war-time is not only timely but satisfying. We discover that a right view of life will answer many of our questions and that true prayer finds 'no' is an answer to our unwise petitions. The final chapter deals with God in history and asks is there such a thing as a Christian world view? The Bible stands for a moral interpretation of history which is the sphere of a moral and spiritual drama definitely moving to a consummation of which the Resurrection is the heart. The Resurrection implies a future judgement of a world that does not automatically improve though there is definite progress. God is at work in this world, always, everywhere. Christ's life and work and the Coming of the Kingdom are the crown of His creative purpose revealed by His Holy Spirit. This volume is significant in its arguments and valid for all who maintained the faith in this dark age.

The Winds Blow. By Rita F. Snowden. (Epworth Press. 3s. 6d.)

Miss Rita Snowden has given us a worthy successor to her previous books. There is the glory of the open air, the glow of the fireside, and the glamour of the world's pageantry in this volume. Once again it is a collection of letters from Joan to Jill and the sound philosophy of the author is blended with apt quotations and quaint descriptions into a refreshing whole. Many of the stories told are new, and the oldest of the others has a fresh light upon it. It is a helpful book for young folk and from the rich stores of her notebook the author has strung together a necklace of thought that will be much prized by her wide circle of friends here and 'down under'. The format of the book is most pleasing and the cover design and frontispiece are works of real art by Horace Knowles. As a gift book it will be greatly appreciated, and as a companion to her previous volumes be heartily welcomed.

God in Our Street. By George Stewart. (Religious Book Club. 2s. 6d.)

The title of this volume, as also the glaring snow-covered picture on the paper jacket, are no doubt meant to arrest the attention at a glance, but it is doubtful whether an outward appearance having so little to do with the inner contents is likely to achieve the purpose. One naturally expects to find an intimate house-to-house story, possibly something after the fashion of *God in the Slums*, but nothing of the kind is forthcoming. Instead the whole book is a closely arranged treatise on our knowledge of God, and significant conceptions of God, in the first part of the book. And then part two: Jesus Christ: God as the Word made flesh. Part three is a brief consideration of the Holy Spirit: God as Inspiration. The author claims no originality of thought or treatment, and acknowledges help from many sources. It is a thoughtful, helpful account touching great themes in small compass. To the thoughtful general reader it will give a glimpse of how tremendous are the themes lightly touched, and may help some to a personal obedience to Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour, and an anchorage in these troubled times.

W. G. T. B.

The Friendly Year. By H. L. Gee. (Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.)

This is a golden book of insight, sympathy, courage, and inspiration and the ideal gift for hundreds of folk this Christmas. Well produced with artistic end papers and striking cloth cover, it is a marvel of cheapness combined with quality for half a crown. All the charm of Mr. Gee's previous books is maintained in this one. He walks through a humdrum, weary, war-stricken day and sees the glint of heaven. There is a charm that lures the reader from first to last and which will stand constant perusal. The reviewer tried the book out on two audiences. The first was composed of one other person and when the excerpt was finished there was a silence broken by one word—true. The book held my companion spellbound. The second was in a crowded air raid shelter. Outside there was a wintry storm, a heavy barrage, and an enemy drone. I read 'The Trivial Round', and the result is, I have to read the book through incident by incident, night by night. It changed the whole spirit of the motley crowd so much that prayer naturally followed. What greater praise could there be for a book than to comfort, charm, and heal all manner of folk in these days. It does all this and more. This Friendly Year will hasten the Year of Peace and Goodwill.

The Light of Christ in a Pagan World. By John A. Hughes. (Allen & Unwin. Cloth 2s. 6d. Paper 1s. 6d.)

The Swarthmore Lecture this year was given on 'The Light of Christ in a Pagan World', by John A. Hughes. The lecturer believes that this

war-time is a supreme opportunity for preaching the Gospel. We see in strife the token of universal human sin and failure. Disillusionment is rife and has affected every sphere of life. Substitute faiths have sprung up that are less than Divine and will prove less than human. Disillusionment has led to apathy. The Nonconformist conscience is dead and there is a moral insensitivity, an open disregard of truth and honour, and a secularization of education. The week-end habit has grown and with it a half-shy, half-hostile attitude to religion. It is only in the face of Jesus Christ that we can find a remedy. That light is dawning in all branches of the Christian Church in a new evangelical movement. There is new light on the Gospel Records, on the mysteries of the Incarnation, the Apocalypse, Sin and the Church. For the new evangelism the preacher must be prepared. The speaker of good tidings must be inspired, informed, and utterly sacrificial. Then as of old we shall experience Pentecost and hear the call to go into all the world. This lecture should be considered by all leaders in the Christian Church.

Nurseries of Christians. By John W. Skinner. (Epworth Press. 4d.)

The series of Pilot Books issued by the Epworth Press give special attention to the Theme of the Christians and World Affairs.

The books issued have been worthy of the Theme and have been written by experts. They are modern, masterly, and meaningful. The latest issue is entitled *Nurseries of Christians* and is a call for Christian Schools. That call is sounded by Dr. J. W. Skinner, the Head Master of Culford School.

The writer insists that the main task of British education, now and after the war, is the production of Christians—the nurseries will be the schools.

It has been a matter of concern to many that the religion in modern schools has not produced Christians, the teaching of Scripture to say the least has not been satisfactory. There is a real menace in the paganism of our schools, due sometimes to the schoolmasters themselves.

Dr. Skinner, great Christian as he is, outlines his creed. He believes that we ought to make denominational Christians, so long as they are Christians first and denominationalists second. With goodwill the religious front could be united to make lovers and servers of God, as well as lovers and servers of men. This may be accomplished through God, the Bible, School Worship and ourselves as Teachers. Of these sources Dr. Skinner speaks in turn, emphasizing the specialized teaching of Scripture. The vital need is that Home, Church and School shall be nurseries of Christians.

This essay is a fine contribution to the series and worthy of the attention of all parents and teachers.

Ask the Prophets. By C. S. Knopf, PH.D. (Abingdon Press. 75 cents.)

The writer offers a Bible Study Manual, which is really a bald survey of the history and prophets of Israel. It is a high-speed, streamlined effort, full of short staccato sentences, which, however, do convey much information. There is no quiet about the book. To English readers the American phrases are as perplexing as Hebrew roots.

The chapter heads are 'inquiries', and four small pages of print usually suffice for the study of a prophet and his message. The facts concerning teacher training is epitomized so much that in one session the study of Nahum, Habakkuk, and Jeremiah is completed.

The whole volume is breathless and dogmatic. Its presentation will militate against its circulation on this side of the Atlantic.

Spiritual Religion. By Sir James Baillie, M.A., D.PHIL. (Allen & Unwin. 1s.)

The article contributed by Dr. Baillie to the *Hibbert Journal* eight years ago has been issued as a booklet. It is worthy of its new format. The possession of spiritual religion does not depend on philosophy, theology, or science, it is the privilege and possibility open to the trusting soul. In this article Dr. Baillie discusses the purpose, procedure, and maintenance of man's spiritual activity and shows that it is subject to his emotions, ideas, and actions, all of which are inseparable and yet distinct. The pursuit of Truth, Goodness, and Beauty gives value to our lives though the complete attainment of them on earth is impossible. The essential aim of spiritual religion is the securing and maintaining of a state of peace of soul. This is effected by Faith, which is a form of communion with the Divine, Hope which makes the future safe and convinces us of immortality, and Love which brings the life of the Divine into the soul of man. This love is the peculiar and unique achievement of Christianity. The Love of God is fully expressed in the Incarnation and verified by the Resurrection. To the thoughtful reader this booklet is a timely reprint for which he will be grateful.

A Second Day of God. By A. F. Winnington-Ingram. (Longmans. 1s.)

Dr. Winnington-Ingram has issued four war-time addresses in booklet form. They have all the virility and directness we have long associated with him and the good sound sense here manifested is just what is needed.

It is interesting to note how the conduct of the war has changed his opinions as indicated in the footnotes.

This book should have a large sale.

Periodical Literature

BRITISH

Journal of Theological Studies (July-October, 1940).—This important periodical will for the duration of the war appear twice a year, instead of quarterly. The present number contains about 125 pages, together with the indexes for vol. xli. The article this time is by Professor S. A. Cook, and deals with 'Biblical Criticism, Theology, and Philosophy'. 'Notes and Studies' provide some excellent fare, beginning with Dr. F. H. Colson's contribution on 'Philo's Quotations from the Old Testament'. C. C. Tarelli has another textual contribution, this time on 'The Chester Beatty Papyrus and the Western and Byzantine Texts'. A long series of highly competent reviews completes the number, the most important of which are perhaps Prof. A. D. Nock's discriminating appreciation of Canon Knox's *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, and Dr. Clement Webb's review of the late Prof. S. Alexander's *Philosophical and Literary Pieces* and A. C. Bradley's *Ideals of Religion*.

Religion in Education (July 1940; S.C.M. Press).—This issue opens with a tentative statement of faith by the Archdeacon of York, which is intended for teachers. The Head Master of Rugby, Hugh Lyon, contributes an address given at Oxford, on 'The Spiritual Basis of World Citizenship', but rightly concludes that World Citizenship must be an extension of national loyalty and not a substitute for it. Nationalism has no morality, and the greatest problem of post-war Europe will be how to instil moral principles into millions of good citizens who have never acquired individuality. Such a problem is not solved by humanism which lacks driving force, righteous indignation, an overriding motive and a sure ground of hope. The problem has only one answer—the spiritual, and for this end there needs to be a revival in organized worship. The Head Master of Alwyn's School, R. B. Henderson, asks 'Will the structure hold?' He surveys with alarm the present position of religion in education and yet feels that the structure will hold because the heart of the people is sound, and the character of the teaching actually given in modern schools is the final victory of truth. In the stabilizing the Universities must play a large part. Canon Tatlow considers the result of an inquiry on education. The evidence goes to prove a general lack of ordered home life, in which religion is neglected. The working-class home is better in this respect than the middle-class professional home in the pre-adolescent years. The evacuated children enjoy the country life and benefit by it and the Sunday Schools in such areas are provided. The opportunity for the Church is a great one and the affection of the children for their hosts is most marked, while the teachers of evacuated schools have

been exemplary in their sacrificing service for their scholars. Dr. E. L. Allen writes of 'The Roots of Democracy in the Old Testament' and traces democracy back to the Old Testament and to the conception of organized society as resting on a covenant made in the presence of God, arguing that the political sphere to-day must recognize the sovereignty of moral values. The Chaplain of Kingswood School, Rev. R. E. Davies, relates his interesting experiment in worship in Wesley's famous school. Dr. E. J. Rae gives the vital background necessary to the study of the Book of Acts, as an example of all such preparation on the part of teachers. Miss Engledow describes the work of the Federation of University Women's Camp for Schoolgirls, in which fine religious education is given and outlines the future plans for this good work. The book reviews and annotations are excellent.

The Bulletin of The John Rylands Library, Manchester (October).—The Autumn number of the Bulletin is full of good things. The Editor writes a full, informing, and well-illustrated article on 'The Evolution of Printing' in connection with the five hundredth anniversary of its invention, though the art is as old as creation and as young as to-day. The professor of Geography in Manchester University (Dr. H. J. Fleure) presents a lecture given on 'Race and its Meaning in Europe'. He speaks of the different uses of the word and of the physical, mental, and cultural factors that constitute race. He believes it is only by building up an overriding harmony that we may create a commonwealth. To the Librarian (Dr. H. Guppy) we are indebted for an account of 'Twice Raped Louvain'. The tragedy of the spoliation of that famous library is poignant to us all. An account of the recently discovered copy of Edward Hall's *Union of the Noble Houses of Lancaster and York* is given by Alan Keen. This copy is notable for its manuscript additions. Interesting and quaint indeed are the accounts of Queen Joan of Navarre under the title 'The Captivity of a Royal Witch', from the pen of Mr. A. R. Myers. Dr. Edward Robertson estimates the extent and importance of early navigation in the seas now traversed by a runaway Italian navy and a watchful Empire fleet. The evolution of the ship is a romantic story of international effort. Ibn Khaldun, the subject of Dr. E. I. J. Rosenthal's article, was a North African Muslim thinker of the fourteenth century and the inventor of a new science of history. His name is a landmark for the development of Historical Studies. In this article we have a résumé of the system. 'The Chinese Sages and the Golden Rule' of which Dr. H. H. Rowley writes offers much material not easily obtained and shows that the Gospels is unique. The Keeper of the Western Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library (Dr. F. Taylor) describes some of the treasures comprising the Hatton Wood Manuscripts and some manuscripts of the 'Libelle of Englyshe Polycye', a little book on economic and political geography.

The International Review of Missions (October).—This issue opens with an article by Dr. K. S. Latourette on 'Indigenous Christianity in the Light of History'. The word indigenous is used in the sense that to each people the Gospel shall come as their own and not something alien. He concludes that Christianity has never been successfully planted except by those of profound faith and deep conviction who have been thoroughly committed to Christ and in whom have been apparent the fruits of the Spirit. Dr. E. McDougall presents with the authority of long experience 'Some Problems of the Higher Education of Indian Women'. The remarkable educational progress of the women of India began in the missionary schools. The educated woman has acquired an obvious value and importance, but there are disquieting features. Husbands are often parasites on their wives' earnings and home life is adversely affected by the employment of married women. The teacher is as important as the doctor, and as women exercise a greater influence on public ideals than men, the higher education of Indian women may decide the Christian or pagan future of that land. Rev. E. W. Thompson considers the recommendations and implications of the West Indian Royal Commission in a thought provoking paper. The social reconstruction of West Indian life is an imperative need. The Church must co-operate in education and campaign against the social evils. 'Missionary Agency in Colonial Development' is the subject of a paper by T. Price. It is inspired by the allocation made for colonial government within the British Empire. Christianity has been in the forefront of the social and spiritual welfare of native peoples and the missionaries should have adequate representation and authority on the body controlling the expenditure of the Empire grant, and financial support for the work they are doing particularly in education. Care must be taken not to exploit the native or to make the missionaries civil servants. Miss Margaret Wrong continues the same theme in her contribution 'Colonial Development and Welfare'. She pleads for co-operation in education and forward planning even in a time of war. Mr. E. Amu is frankly critical of the position of Christianity in modern Africa. He thinks Africa is becoming more materialistic and degenerate, and proposes a way of recovery. The Editor in his article on 'Christianity and Civilization' reviews recent crisis literature and interprets it as a challenge to Christianity. Hans Kosmala writes of the Jews in their new environment and discusses the present situation of Judaism. T. W. Douglas James estimates the great contribution that Campbell N. Moody made to missionary thinking. The Sino-Japanese conflict and the Christian movement in Japan is Dr. J. W. Decker's theme on the troubles and triumphs of work in the Far East. Reviews are full, general and signed, and the whole number is of real value.

Eastern Churches Quarterly (July 1940; Coldwell. 1s.).—

This quarterly seeks to help Western Catholics to understand the Christian Tradition of the East with a view to the reunion of the Dissident Eastern Churches. The third article in the series 'The Liturgy and Reunion' deals with the words of consecration in the tradition of the Eastern Churches. The acceptance of transubstantiation on the evidence of the Fathers appears to us to beg the question and to be special pleading. The second article 'Liturgy and the Love of God' is a criticism of Aelred Graham's book *The Love of God*. The third contribution deals with 'The Cultural-Ecclesiastical Problem of Finland' by V. James, who is a member of the Orthodox Church. This article is abridged and in parts summarized and we have no means of discovering whether these actions are fair to the writer. The remainder of this issue is devoted to a review of reviews, paragraphs of news, comments, letters to the Editor, and notes of recent publications.

AMERICAN

The Yale Review (Autumn, 1940).—For anyone who wants to understand the attitude of various types of American to the European situation and to the wider issues of the war, it is quite necessary to follow the debate that reached its climax in the recent election of President Roosevelt for a third time at the White House. Four articles under the general heading 'Underlying Issues of the Campaign' have been written by members of the Professorial staff of Yale. They are entitled, 'Political Preface', 'Economic Questions', 'Some Aspects of Foreign Policy', and 'The Young Voters'. Then John Chamberlain, Book Editor of *Harper's*, writes on 'Candidates and Speeches'. Amongst these serious contributions by a decidedly academic team it is interesting to find Mr. H. M. Tomlinson writing on 'Propaganda'. This brilliantly written Review does not represent the point of view of the Middle West, but of the most sophisticated constituency in the East, not a whit behind Harvard in its European contacts. Yet some of these essays help one to understand the width of the Atlantic Ocean and the difficulty even now of rousing the American intelligentsia from the languorous somnolence of a fools' paradise. When Professor William Clyde Devane tells us that the generation under thirty-five 'is neutral in heart and deed and holds that as between the warring nations "there is no preponderance of good or evil on either side", and that this generation backs its position by petitions to the President urging that "this country should grant no credits, give no supplies, and send no men", we wonder how long it will be before these youngsters enjoy a rude awakening. It is so much like the blind folly of the typical Oxford undergraduate of a few years ago!

The excellently written reviews give an insight into current American literature. This is a most readable and valuable number. But one suspects that many of the essays were written before the Axis had

become a triangle, before the Battle of Britain had been won and lost, and before the latest transformation in the Eastern Mediterranean.

Religion in Life (Autumn Number).—This is again a good number and full of instruction for anyone who wishes to keep in touch with religious thought and Church movements in America. A dozen years ago Humanism seemed to be having it all its own way over there, and even within the Christian Church the theological liberalism which had largely passed away as a power on this side of the Atlantic was rapidly gaining ground. With the tremendous economic collapse ten years ago a swing over to Barthianism was discernible. But something nearer to a stable equilibrium is being reached. In the present number Prof. Harris Franklin Rall leads off with a noteworthy essay, 'Have We a Doctrine of Salvation for Our Day?' With this may be compared Mr. Orlo J. Price's article, 'Which Way Liberalism?' So also the same preoccupation can be discovered in two other essays: 'A Christian View of Freedom', by Professor David E. Roberts, and 'Nature as a Vehicle of Grace', by Professor Georgia Harkness. Among other interesting articles we may mention 'Tides of Persecution' (P. E. Johnson), 'Central Altar or Central Pulpit' (A. W. Blackwood), 'The Theological Seminaries and the Ecumenical Movement' (H. T. Kerr), 'The Christian Home in a Warlike World' (D. A. Poling), and, perhaps most stimulating of all, Dr. A. B. Cohoe's 'The Risk in Christian Worship'. The book reviews, as always, repay careful reading.

The Journal of Religion (July, 1940; University of Chicago Press).

—The main articles in this issue deal respectively with three questions. One is historical and concerns Clement of Alexandria, another is theological on the Philosophy of Religion, and the third is on a practical issue concerning the Use of Christian Words. Dr. A. C. Outler writes on the 'Platonism' of Clement of Alexandria and discusses his effort to define the Christian Faith in terms of the Greek intellectual tradition.

Dr. Edwin R. Walker has followed up a previous article in which he defended the empirical method in theological inquiry, with a spirited reply to the vigorous critics of his former contribution.

Professor H. N. Wieman asks 'Can traditional Christian Words be honestly used by religious leaders whose thinking might be better expressed in another type of terminology?' He believes that the established Christian symbols can only be abandoned with the greatest loss.

The article of Dean Colwell in the previous issue on 'Toward Better Theological Education' has evoked five brief critical replies taking different standpoints. The whole of these provide worthy supplements to that excellent contribution.

Signed critical reviews of modern Theological Literature, both English and American, complete a good number.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

RELIGION, THEOLOGY
PHILOSOPHY, LITERATURE
HISTORY and SOCIOLOGY

Editor:

LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., PH.D.

Advisory Council:

EDGAR C. BARTON

WILBERT F. HOWARD, M.A.,
D.D.

ARCHIBALD W. HARRISON,
M.C., B.A., B.Sc., D.D.

W. LANSDALL WARDLE, M.A.,
D.D.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review is published on the 25th of March, June, September, and December by the Epworth Press, 25-35, City Road, London, E.C.1. It may be obtained from the publishers or any bookseller and from all Methodist ministers at 2s. 6d. a copy (postage 3d.) or 10s. per annum, post free.

All contributions (typewritten if possible) should be addressed to The Editor, 'The London Quarterly and Holborn Review', 25-35, City Road, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

Contents

APRIL 1941

ARTICLES:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| HENRI BERGSON | ERIC S. WATERHOUSE, M.A., D.D. |
| MONOGAMY | C. RYDER SMITH, B.A., D.D. |
| FORWARD MOVEMENT | |
| | ARCHIBALD W. HARRISON, M.C., B.A., B.SC., D.D. |
| THE NEW WORLD THAT IS TO BE | FREDERIC C. SPURR |
| GEORGE CRABBE AND METHODISM | |
| | T. B. SHEPHERD, M.A., PH.D. |
| GUILT AND ATONEMENT | E. L. ALLEN |
| A FORGOTTEN DIARIST | T. W. SCHOLES, M.A. |
| THE BEATING OF DRAKE'S DRUM | WHARTON HUNT |

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS:

- | | |
|---|----------------------------|
| JAMES RENDEL HARRIS | E. E. KELLETT, M.A. |
| THE STATE AND THE INDIVIDUAL CONSCIENCE | |
| | JOHN T. NEWTON |
| THE PERSONALITY OF EZEKIEL | |
| | J. F. HUMPHREY, M.A., B.D. |
| PSYCHIATRY IN PASTORAL PRACTICE | |
| | WILLIAM S. TERRY |
| THE MUTILATION OF PEPYS'S DIARY | DONALD DALE |

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

- | | | |
|----------------------|-------|----------------|
| MINISTERS IN COUNCIL | . . . | W. E. FARNDALE |
|----------------------|-------|----------------|

RECENT LITERATURE

PERIODICAL LITERATURE